UC-NRLF
$B 297 480

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE REIGN OF QUEEN ANNE IN ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY

F. W. WILSON

YB 30722

Oxford
1911

JAN 17 1912
EXCHANGE

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.
RECEIVED BY EXCHANGE
Class

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/thoughtsonanglic00brisrich

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE REIGN OF QUEEN ANNE IN ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE REIGN OF QUEEN ANNE IN ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY

THE GLADSTONE MEMORIAL ESSAY

FOR 1911

BY

FREDERICK WILLIAM WILSON

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY

EXHIBITIONER OF NEW COLLEGE

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

C. W. C. OMAN

CHICHELE PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY

Oxford

B. H. BLACKWELL, BROAD STREET

London

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & CO. LIMITED

MCMXI,

BX5092
W5

UNIV. OF
CALIFORNIA

PREFATORY NOTE.

To deal with a congested period like that from 1702—14 within the statutory limits of 12,500 words is a thankless task. Much has had to be sacrificed and the present "pamphlet" can have no pretensions to completeness. It is but a slender outline which may at some time be elaborated into a larger, more satisfying volume. My best thanks are due to my first teacher of history, Prof. T. F. Tout, M.A., for characteristic and illuminating hints, and to Prof. C. W. C. Oman for so kindly ushering this publication into the world.

F. W. W.

227066

UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA

INTRODUCTION.

I HAVE always been a believer in the advisability of publishing the better sort of University Prize Essays. I do not, of course, mean that all successful compositions should be consigned to the press, but I know, as a not infrequent examiner, of several cases where by non-publication the reading public has been deprived of a useful little monograph, embodying the latest results of research on some interesting subject. But there is another point, which is still more important. The University Prize Winners of to-day are in many cases going to be the writers of history in the coming generation. No training in serious composition can be better than that which consists in the developing of a prize thesis, written under difficulties and against time, into a piece of work which is intended to be complete and permanent. The printing of his essay gives to the young historian the chance of learning his art at an early age: he has done with com-

petition and the temptation to be lively at all costs in order to catch the examiner's eye, and is free to turn an essay into a monograph by leisurely and conscientious revision. I lately had to act as one of the judges for the Gladstone Essay, which is no longer, as it used to be, a mere second prize for the candidate who just fails to win the Stanhope, but is an independent composition. Discovering that the winner was a member of my own old College, in which I had taught history for twenty years, and having found the essay well worth expansion, I was naturally ready to urge the author to rewrite it and put it into print. Much has been written about the Church in the reign of Queen Anne, but readers will find that this essay is not a mere repetition of hackneyed information, nor a rediscussion of the old politico-religious problems of the time, but a piece of work with an original value of its own, dealing with some of the aspects of the time which have often received less notice than they deserve.

C. W. C. OMAN

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE REIGN OF QUEEN ANNE IN ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY.

THE purpose of this essay is to extract from the bewildering detail of the period 1702—1714 certain unities which render it important in the history of the English Church. To dissociate entirely the history of the Church from the history of the State is impossible. An attempt is made to emphasise only movements which affect pre-eminently ecclesiastical history, with two reservations. The history of the State has never been lost sight of, for the chief value of the results of ecclesiastical history is to explain issues otherwise unknown, and the wider movements of the Church History itself have been dealt with rather than the many minor peculiarities of the detailed ecclesiastical life. Controversies especially

have been avoided; they have only been considered with reference to their general relation to the main tendencies of the time.

The reign of Anne is corollary to the Revolution of 1688. Its chief unity of movement follows from the fact that the problems for which it demanded an answer, the issues raised in it, and the divisions of its parties owe their origin to the Revolution. As this is true of the general history of the reign so is it true of the departmental. The same influences are at the basis of the history of the Church; it is only on this foundation that a successful attempt at the delineation and the arrangement of the ecclesiastical facts can be built. Considered primarily in this light the Church History of the reign will be dealt with in six sections. Their interconnection will be indicated, and from the determination of their relationship generalisations will be drawn to show the importance of the period.

The first section deals with the years 1702—1710. It outlines the main theme of these eight years, the bitter strife for power between the High Church or Tory party and the Low Church or Whig party. The strife is inex-

tricably entangled with the political history of the reign; for when the chief difference between the two parties was in the main religious it could not be otherwise. Confusion was intensified by the fact that both parties were led by extremists in political and ecclesiastical matters alike, whose sole concern was a selfish desire for power.

This first period has its chief result in the victory of the Tory and High Church party. It was a victory due to the predilections of of the Queen, the innate Toryism of the mass of the country, the influence of the Tory Clergy on the country, and the capture of the Evangelical movement by the High Church party. The triumph of the High Church party represents a combination of political intrigue with real religious worth and piety. The High Fliers, the extremists, were comparatively few. It was only by the most careful engineering and the many fortunate mistakes of the Whig party that the moderate middle portion of the Church, deeply under the influence of Evangelicalism, was captured and led.

The relation of the Church in such a con-

dition with the movement towards Tolerance must next be considered. Toleration found but part expression in the Latitudinarianism of the Low Church party. It was altogether incompatible with the nature of the progressive movement in the Church. Consequently, Toleration was rejected by the Church because its existence in the country was opposed to the High Church party's desired position as the embodiment of absolutism.

The third division groups together the various expressions of Evangelicalism. They were the product of the revived religious spirit which had been at work previous to 1702, but which required the favourable conditions of Anne's reign to acquire maturity. Opposed to Toleration, but bound close to Evangelicalism, the Church reached the highest point of its power during the years 1710—1714.

Before the examination of the reasons for the failure of the High Church party to render its position permanent, the history of Convocation during the reign is examined. Apart from the all-absorbing Convocation controversy, the work of Convocation lends itself to the same generalisations as are drawn from

the wider Church History. The fall of the High Fliers in 1714 has a natural sequel in the silencing of Convocation in 1717.

At George I.'s accession the High Church party fell from power. There were two reasons, one lay in immediate political facts, and one was more deep-rooted. The innate leaven of early Stuart political theory worked successfully during the reign of the last Stuart Sovereign and the High Fliers became Jacobites. The Tory interest, the moderate middle portion of the Church, though largely sympathetic, refused to follow its leaders. It relapsed into a moody quietism, only to be prominent again when Bolingbroke reorganised the party as the Hanoverian Tories in 1730. The enthusiasm which had inspired the Evangelical movement vanished as quickly as it had come. This Jacobitism of the High Church party and the consequent effect on the country forms the fifth division.

The more deep-rooted cause of the failure of the High Church party lay in the growth of the movement known as Rationalism. This represents, in one sense, an assertion of intellectual freedom, of demanded tolerance, and in

another a rebellion against the last attempts of the Church to establish a hierarchy based on its old theology. In both senses it was destructive. Its attack was delivered under the disguise of philosophy, moral and political. It was an intellectual revolt, and coupled with political developments brought about the collapse of the High Church party. It was the English portion of a European movement. Its effect was to bring England up to date in theological and intellectual thought, and it was accomplished at the cost of nearly the utter loss of Church life and true Christianity. The lamentable state of the Church in the eighteenth century was a consequence of the collapse of the Church party in 1714.

I.

The Revolution had made distinct cleavages in Church and State, which were in the main commensurate. The High Church and the Low Church parties were one and the same with the Tory and the Whig parties. Indeed, purely political differences were few, and

centred almost entirely round the question of the French War. The bitterest differences of the two parties were ecclesiastical ones, and even their political differences were in some sense religious.[1]

The two parties of High and Low Church were divided by "their different ideas of the origin, extent and dignity of the episcopal jurisdiction."[2] The High Church Party asserted that the government of bishops was of divine origin and were over eager in their assertion and jealous guard of the privileges and position of the Church.[3] The characteristics of the Low Church party were in the main their moderate zeal for the episcopal jurisdiction and a willingness to grant the name of a Church to a religious body even though it was not governed by a bishop.[4] The High Church party held to its old theories of divine right and passive obedience

[1] See Lord (W. F.), *Development of Political Parties during the Reign of Queen Anne* (Transac. Royal Hist. Society, New Series, Vol. XIV., p. 73-4, London, 1900).

[2] Mosheim, *Ecclesiastical History* (Trans. 1811), Vol. VI. p. 33. [3] Ibid.

[4] *Somers Collection of Political Tracts*, Vol. XII., p. 665. The Low Church address given here is a good expression of that party's views.

and did not view favourably the prospect of the Hanoverian succession. The Low Church party had denounced the doctrines long dear to the Church and had bound up their interest closely with the Protestant succession.

The reign of William represents the ascendancy of the latter party. It was the ascendancy of a minority. A bargain had been struck with one of the astutest of monarchs, and in the face of William's whiggish tendencies the mass of the country did their part sulkily. It was only an imprudent act of an otherwise careful king which fanned the almost dead embers of enthusiasm or sympathy with a foreign war into the flame which comforted and gratified William's last months. Louis XIV., on the death of James II., recognised his son as King of England, and the English Parliament at last allowed the country to be definitely committed to the Grand Alliance.

William had come to England with the avowed intention of defending the "Protestant Religion." He found the English Church in rebellion at the attempts of James II. to convert it to the Roman Catholic Religion. He found its bishops and leading clergy faced

with the dilemma which had faced Cranmer.[1] They were called upon by the dictates of conscience to repudiate a doctrine they had incorporated into the theology of the Church and which they had fervently preached. "The Lord's anointed"—"the Head of the Church of England"—had been false to his trust, he had tried to impose on the country, by illegal means, a religion which the people detested and loathed. They had to defend their charges, to remain true to their ordination vows, and at the same time to renounce the doctrines of divine right and passive obedience.

This attitude and these doctrines were held by the mass of the clergy, and, because of the clergy's great influence in the country, by the mass of the people. William was accordingly viewed with suspicion. He was a foreigner and no friend of the Church. He would never accept the doctrine of Apostolical succession seriously,[2] and his well-meant desires to unite the English and Dutch

[1] Pollard. *Cranmer*, p. 363-5 and 381. "For good or for ill he had pinned his faith and allegiance to the State, and logically he was driven to obey the State.

[2] Lord, *Development of Political Parties*, p. 75.

Churches alienated the body of the former Church from him. Some of the clergy indeed never would accept him. They found they believed in divine hereditary right more than they feared the Romanist policy of the Stuarts. They could not accept the "Act of Settlement" or the "Abjuration Act," and by Midsummer 1691 Archbishop Sancroft, five bishops and about four hundred clergy were deprived of their position in the established Church.[1]

Considering the deep-rooted nature of the doctrine of divine right and passive obedience it is remarkable that the Church as a whole offered no opposition to William. The main body of the clergy waited patiently for the accession of a Tory and Stuart Princess and recognised the futility of opposition. The more dignified part of the clergy, "the wearers of the gown and scarlet hood,"[2] were by the careful exercise of preferments made agreeable to the King. They were Whigs and sympathised with his enlightened Toleration policy as well as his Continental pro-

[1] Lathbury, *History of the Non-Jurors*, pp. 84 and 107.
[2] Swift.

jects. They were Latitudinarians and were too advanced for the sturdy narrow bigotry of the body of the clergy. Men like Burnet, Tillotson and Tenison, the leaders of the Whig hierarchy of William, were in constant opposition to and entirely out of sympathy with the Lower House of Convocation and the interests that house represented.

The reign of William allowed the passions raised by the Revolution to settle somewhat, and by the accession of Anne the parties in the Church, though still including the sharp antagonisms of the Revolution, included also some points of resemblance and sympathy which tended to widen the basis of the Church and to leave a body of extremists at either end almost isolated. The main body of the clergy were firmly attached to the Church of their ministry. They were Tories but not extreme Tories. They would "rather have a Turk for a king than a Papist."[1] They were very sensitive to the cry "the Church in Danger," and were jealous in the extreme of their privileges and position in the country. Toleration was viewed by them with feelings

[1] *Stuart Papers*, Hist. MSS. Com., Vol. I., p. 50 (Intro.).

of indifference or apprehension, and they were by no means inclined to view with favour the advanced and premature proposals of the Whig Episcopacy. They supported the Protestant succession but wished for the impossible ideal of a Stuart succession of direct descent which would be faithful to Coronation Oaths. The clergy may have been Jacobite in sympathy and given to wistful yearnings in the direction of St. Germains, but on the whole they were closely allied to the best interests of the Church and State. When they were purged of their Jacobitism by the catastrophe of 1714 they developed into the Hanoverian Tories. They found that tampering with the Pretender meant ruin. They had to uphold the Protestant succession at all costs. At one extreme of the clergy, closely akin to the non-Jurors in their theoretical basis but not troubled by conscience as they were, were the "High Fliers."[1] Though Churchmen they were first and foremost politicians. Girt in the doctrines of passive obedience and divine right, and brandishing their infallible weapon "The Church is in

[1] The name is often used by Oldmixon.

Danger," they bore down on the body of the clergy, and under cover of the adulation they showered upon Anne tried to bring about the Pretender's return. Their chief fear was not for the Church's danger, but for the Whig supremacy which they suspected the Hanoverian succession would inaugurate. Through their clever party tactics, and by a happy combination of enthusiasm and fortune, they took the Church with them along a road marked by such milestones as the Occasional Conformity Bill of 1702-1703-1705, "The Church in Danger" debate of 1705, the trial of Dr. Sacheverell, the elections of 1710, the Occasional Conformity Act of 1713, and the Schism Act of 1714. But though the Church would follow Harley and Swift it would not follow Bolingbroke and Atterbury. The High Fliers struggled hard for power, gained the perilous heights of 1710-14, and because of the great height, came the greater fall.

The other distinct party of the clergy were equally extreme. They were the Whigs or the Low Church party. Their interests were bound up in the Hanoverian succession, and their political principles were the formulated

principles of the Revolution.[1] The troubles of the Revolution, and the great emphasis laid on Protestantism during that time, led them to a Catholicity of Protestant feeling which made them desirous of widening the doors of the Church of England, or of effecting "rapprochements" with Protestants abroad.[2]

The bias of these two parties of extremists was towards political affairs rather than towards ecclesiastical. Though they were to a certain extent leaders of the Church's two main ways of thought, they were not followed in an entirety. Rebellions from the autocracy and headstrong recklessness of party leaders were common during the reign, and much controversy and intrigue of the politico-ecclesiastical history can be thus grouped. The intrinsic value of such rebellions is not often of great value except in so far as pointing to the growth of power of the moderate feeling

[1] Burke, *Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs*, Works, Vol. IV. (1852). The trial of Sacheverell was a vindication of these principles.

[2] Burnet says that what his enemies most resented was that "I had not carried the Church power higher, that I had owned the foreign Protestant Churches to be true Churches." *Life*, by Clarke and Foxcroft, p. 368.

in the country. For the permanent can only spring from the deep-rooted, and this alone is important in a period. Though there is much that is important in the strife between the High Church and the Low Church parties for power, yet the greater importance lies in reasons of the High Church triumph and in the analysis of its failure even when joined by the potential movement of Evangelicalism.

The accession of Queen Anne was hailed by the leaders of the High Church party with great delight, and public opinion eagerly confirmed their joy. "The High Church party soon grew triumphant and thought of nothing less than carrying all before them,"[1] and their elation was copied by the mob who in various places in the country showed its piety by pulling down the meeting-houses.[2]

Anne's ancestry was sufficient guarantee for her orthodoxy, and her education had further confirmed and trained her natural tendencies.[3] The first speeches she made to Parliament plainly showed her interest. "My own princi-

[1] *Calamy's Life*, Vol. II., p. 460 (Ed. 1829).

[2] This became the ordinary form of demonstration of Tory feeling. See Addison, Spectator and Calamy's Abridgement.

[3] She was educated by Bishop Compton.

ples must always keep me firm to the interests of the religion of the Church of England, and will incline me to countenance those who have the truest zeal to support it."[1] She was a fitting person to receive Tory and High Church flattery, and was willing to occupy docilely their pedestal, waiting for any monarch who would agree with their theories. "Her heart," she said, "was entirely English,"[2] an expression which was thought to reflect on the late King.[3] She managed during her reign by her sympathy and favour to the Church to make her people believe in her boast. She was a dull, easily led person, but possessed obstinately of certain principles, of which her love for the Church was the chief. She was a regular communicant and attender at church, it being a matter for surprise when she absented herself.[4] She kept a watchful eye over preferments, and one of her first acts was to dissolve the Whig Commission of Bishops appointed by William to look after

[1] *Parliamentary History*, Vol. VI., p. 25.
[2] Ibid., p. 5.
[3] Burnet, *History of his own Times* (Ed. 1833), Vol. VI., p. 3.
[4] Swift, in his journal to Stella, mentions every time the Queen is not at chapel.

preferments.[1] "'Tis said that her Majesty will herself dispose of all ecclesiastical preferments belonging to the crown as they become vacant."[2]

Her care for the Church was very real, and took a lasting and material shape in her granting the revenues arising out of the first fruits and tenths for the purpose of augmenting the benefices of the poorer clergy. "We are justly sensible," the Commons had said, "of your Majesty's unparalleled goodness."[3] Anne was pleased to call the Tory party the Church party,[4] and though she distrusted the extremists who would have preferred her half-brother, and though there was never a definite court interest during the reign, yet Anne's attachment to the Church was sufficiently strong to warrant the clergy's attitude when her ear was possessed by a Whig Ministry. "The clergy took great pains to infuse into all people tragical apprehensions of the danger the Church was in . . . Books were writ and dispersed over the nation with great industry to possess

[1] Burnet, *History of his own Times*, Vol. VI., p. 17.
[2] Luttrell, *Diary*, Vol. V., p. 157.
[3] *Parliamentary History*, Vol. V., 328-30.
[4] *Conduct of the Duchess of Marlborough*, p. 124.

all people with the apprehension that the Church was to be given up, that the bishops were betraying it."[1] That was in 1705, and 1710 Burnet again wrote "The clergy pressed the people to show on this great occasion their zeal for the Church, and now or never to save it; they also told them in what ill the Queen had been kept, as in captivity, and that it was a charity, as well as their duty, to free her from the power the late Ministry exercised over her."[2]

Despite Anne's predilections and the energy and zeal of the clergy, the rise of the High Church party to power was a difficult uphill task. Against High Church enthusiasm was to be placed the wonderful series of successes the allied arms had achieved under Marlborough.[3] The Tories, as the peace party, fell into discredit. They were not trusted by the allies, as they were justly suspected of being friends to France.[4] Their attitude to-

[1] Burnet, *History of his own Times*, Vol. v., p. 222.

[2] Ibid., Vol. vi., p. 16.

[3] Oldmixon, *History of England under the Stuarts*, Vol. ii., p. 293.

[4] Ibid., p. 275. The friendship of the French Kings to Charles I. and Charles II. was at the bottom of these suspicions.

wards the war alienated Marlborough and Godolphin, hitherto ranked as Tories, and as most people thought with Oldmixon that "the Duke's victories were the greatest and most glorious that ever were obtained by the English arms abroad,"[1] and as they "were everywhere expressing their joy"[2] public opinion became decidedly Whig. The war was the dominant interest. The country was not concerned with keeping a Whig or Tory Ministry in power. Its sole care was for keeping a Ministry in office which would support Marlborough. It was not till Marlborough's influence with the Queen was lessening, and the country was thoroughly alarmed at the ruinous expenses of the war[3] that the basmotifs of the Tory party, the doctrines of High Church and the cry of "The Church in Danger" began to be heard above the intoxicating blare of the war trumpets. "Six millions of supplies and almost fifty millions of debt," wrote Swift, "the High Allies have been the

[1] Oldmixon, *History of England under the Stuarts*, Vol. II., p. 344. [2] Ibid., p. 342.

[3] Swift's pamphlet, *The Conduct of the Allies*, advocated peace on the grounds of the ruinous expense, and of the war only benefitting the Allies.

death of us."[1] These unmistakable signs of revulsion to the war were eagerly noticed by Harley, and were through Abigail Masham carefully communicated to the Queen. It was only when Anne was sure that the country had started on the backward swing of the pendelum that she dared act directly against the Whig interest, against Marlborough and his hectoring wife. The appointment of the two Tory bishops at the close of 1706 was an augury of the coming change.[2] Marlborough's influence, though definitely on the decline, was still powerful enough to purge the Ministry in February, 1708, of Harley and St. John, whom he justly suspected of being at the bottom of Anne's unwonted independence.[3] The Duke renewed the war in the Netherlands and decked himself further with the doubtful glories of the victory of Malplaquet. Harley, though no longer in office, still kept the confidence of the Queen, by means of the back door influence of Mrs. Masham. The High Church interest had suffered a temporary

[1] Quoted by J. R. Green, *Short History of the English People*, p. 718.

[2] Burnet, *History of his own Times*, Vol. v., p. 335.

[3] See Roscoe, *Life of Harley*, and Leadam, *Political History*, p. 125.

rebuff, but it was still the coming force in the country.

In April, 1709, the Duchess of Marlborough was finally supplanted in the Queen's favour by Mrs. Masham. Anne's judgment was always dictated by the possessor of her ear, and now her affection for the Church could be freely played upon. The country, too, was seething with unrest. The long ascendancy of the Whigs, their ruinous war policy, their realisation of the Union with Scotland,[1] had produced an uneasy feeling of suspicion and dissatisfaction.[2] These feelings were carefully educated by the clergy, for the power of the pulpit was great. "In the character of pastors and teachers you have an almost irresistible power over us of your congregations . . . . circumstances of education and fortune place the minds of the people, from age to age, under your direction."[3] This power was used almost entirely

[1] The Union was said to endanger the Church of England by the introduction of Presbyterians into Parliament, and an Act for the security of the Church was passed (*Parliamentary Debates*, Vol. IV., p. 480, Ed. 1741). For an answer to these fears see *Somers, Tracts XII.*, pp. 510 and 519.

[2] The Moderate Tory view is well seen in a pamphlet attributed to Harley, *Faults on both sides* (1710).

[3] Steele, *The Crisis*, p. 1 (1713).

for the Tories. The favourite theme was the peril the Established Church was in, and it was illustrated by practically the whole of Whig legislation and tendencies. The Tory conception of the Church and State being commensurate was opposed to the Latitudinarianism of the Whigs. The relations which the Low Church Churchmen sought to establish with the Dissenters and with Foreign Protestants were viewed with horror by the upholders of absolution.[1]

Sermons were supplemented by a rapid flow of inflammatory and embittered pamphlets.[2] The height of Tory and Church indignation was reached in Sacheverell's famous sermon preached in St. Paul's on the 5th of November, 1709. A personal allusion to Godolphin, which it contained, rather than its fanaticism and unmeasured abuse, provoked the subsequent and ill-advised trial. "The foolish prosecution of Sacheverell carried party rage to the

[1] Overton, *Life in the English Church*, pp. 348-352. Burnet was always interested in these movements, *History of his own Times*, Vol. v., p. 328.

[2] See, for instance, the effect of Dr. Drake's pamphlet, *The Memorial of the Church of England.*

height,"[1] Bolingbroke afterwards wrote. High Church fanaticism swept the country, and Somers' prophecy that the trial was likely to end in the ruin of the Whig party was amply fulfilled.[2]

In August, 1710, Godolphin was dismissed and Harley received office. His moderateness was swallowed up in the swirl of the high tide of Tory feeling. He wished for some kind of coalition government, and did not desire the Tories to be too numerous.[3] But "the ferment raised by Dr. Sacheverell's trial . . . being industriously fomented and propagated throughout the kingdom in order to influence elections"[4] carried all before it. The Tories were returned by a great majority, and the political influence of the Church reached its zenith.[5]

These are the main outlines of the politico-ecclesiastical history of the first period. Their chief importance lies not so much in

[1] Bolingbroke, *State of Parties at the Accession of George I.* (Pollard's *Political Pamphlets*), p. 178.

[2] Swift, *History of the last four years of the Reign of Queen Anne*, Vol. VI., p. 31 (Edition, 1808).

[3] Swift, *Journal to Stella*, Works, ed. Sheridan and Nichol, Vol. XIV., p. 245.

[4] *Parliamentary History*, Vol. VI., p. 916.

[5] Perry, *History of the Church of England*, Vol. II., p. 577.

the fact of the triumph of one party as in the reasons underlying this triumph. On the surface the great political influence of the Church seems all important, but this great political influence owes its existence to basic reasons, more permanent and therefore more important. The Church was bound up too intimately with politics; its greatest media of expression were found in political life. This expression is however limited, its seeming breadth and depth of interest are really narrow. The chief note appears at first hearing to be the surging dominance of the triumph of a political party with its main interests ecclesiastical. This is far from being true.

The two extremist parties, fundamentally antagonistic, were dependent on the main body of public opinion. Success in the political world could only be obtained through the adherence of this main element. While this body was on the whole Tory, and loyally Church, it was far from being of the nature of either of its impassioned leaders. The Low Churchmen had always to recognise the fact of their being alienated from the nucleus, but their strong and continual attempts to capture

it demonstrate clearly that it was equally alienated from the High Fliers. The opinion of sober-minded men was the sole referendum of both parties. It was because the appeal of the High Fliers to the people was successful that the elections of 1710 resulted in a Tory victory. The links of sympathy are to be found in the similarity of attitude adopted by both to the two main movements of the day. Toleration was rejected by both, and the Evangelical movement became the spiritual support of the Church.

II.

By accepting the Revolution the Church was unwillingly forced to acquiese in the consequent measures towards Toleration. The common danger Protestantism had suffered from James's designs had emphasised the bond of union between the Dissenters and the Church.[1] Both could and did join in hating Roman Catholicism. It was plain that some different treatment should be meted out to Dissenters from that given to Roman Catholics. This had been ungraciously recog-

[1] Macaulay, *History of England*, Vol. II., p. 219 (Ed. 1850).

nised by William's Toleration Act. Though the measure was introduced by a Tory and jealous Churchman[1] it was not popular with the Church. When the panic raised in 1688 died down, the Act was openly regretted, and the comprehension which would in some degree have completed its work was dropped. Churchmen of the seventeenth century could not be convinced that it was possible for a man to be a bad Churchman yet a good citizen. The interests of Church and State were thought to be identical. Any proposals of toleration had always been checked by the belief that it was unsafe to entrust any part of the government of the State, central or local, to non-members of the Church.[2] This feeling was at the core of the political theory of the Tory party. Laud and Charles I. were in some sense its martyrs, and Charles II. had returned with a tacit recognition of its impossibility. But the Declaration of Breda had been followed by the Clarendon Code.

[1] Shaftesbury, Clarke and Foxcroft's *Life and Letters of the Marquis of Halifax*, Vol. II., pp. 366-378; "*Letters to a Dissenter*"; and "*Anatomy of an Equivalent*," pp. 426-446.

[2] See "The Case of Dissenters, etc.", by a Gentleman (1703), in *Somers Tracts*, Vol. XII., p. 227.

Charles II.'s easy indifference had permitted this view to be once more put upon the Statute Book. The Revolution and the Whig leaders—inspired by William—endeavoured their best to mitigate it somewhat.

The accession of Anne seemed to the Church to be a pledge that all unclean connection with Dissent would cease. The Church would at last be able to assert triumphantly its true position; the obnoxious Tolerance would at last be divorced from Church policy. Theoretically, the Church might recognise some difference between the Protestant Dissenter and the Papist,[1] yet practically it was a dangerous thing to do. To this fear was added revulsion felt at the horrible profanation caused by the Test Act. By Occasional Conformity, Dissenters could qualify themselves for office. Communion was taken by them "not from piety but employments."[2] It was unfortunate for Dissent that there was much truth in the cry raised, but that really mattered little. The main

[1] See the speeches of Tories in the House on the Occasional Conformity Bill.

[2] Swift, *Journal to Stella*, Works, Vol. xv., p. 188.

body of the Church, except for the few enlightened spirits, was definitely set against Toleration. It was an attitude of mind necessary to the establishment of a hierarchy —and it was an attitude of mind produced by a dull, faithful and rather stupid love for the Church.[1]

The attempt of the Church to smother Dissent took the shape of the Occasional Conformity Bill. The preamble to the Bill stated the principle of the co-extensiveness of Church and State in no indefinite terms, and the doctrine was reiterated equally clearly in the House of Commons. "That the intent of this Bill for preventing Occasional Conformity is only to restrain, to put a stop to, a very scandalous practice, which, as a reproach to religion, gives offence to all good Christians"[2] was merely a nominal reason was generally recognised. Other reasons were put forward as being at the bottom of the Bill. It was thought "to be a measure to raise such quarrels and distractions among us as would so embroil us at home, that our allies

[1] *Sacheverell's Sermon*, p. 15.
[2] *Parliamentary History*, Vol. VI., p. 73.

might see they could not depend on us,"[1] to be "without further design than to expose the Dissenters and show what rogues they were."[2] Whig partisans said that it proceeded from the hatred the High Church party bore the Dissenters for their zeal for the Protestant succession.[3] Serious minded men were actuated probably by the argument that it was a Bill "to prevent hypocrisy,"[4] and that the very existence of the National Church was in peril when its chief bulwark, the Sacramental Test, was rendered ineffective.[5] But most people were led by a lingering, long-hidden sense of revenge, which was most attractively expressed in the general desire to exalt the Church and to guard her from all attacks, open or insidious. De Foe's pamphlet—*The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*—was interpreted and considered as excellent advice by many, his satire was dangerously true.

While this was the attitude of the majority

[1] Burnet, *History of His Own Times*, Vol. v., p. 52.

[2] Ibid., p. 49, Dartmouth's Note.

[3] *Oldmixon*, p. 296.

[4] *Parliamentary History*, Vol. vi., p. 52.

[5] Nicholson, *Letters on Various Subjects*, Sect. 9, p. 473 (1717), and Swift, *Letters Concerning the Sacramental Test*, Works, Vol. iii., p. 139 (1708).

it must not be forgotten that Toleration and the ideas held about it progressed considerably. The mass of the people reluctantly gave up the thought of granting Toleration to the Dissenters at the call of the High Church leaders. They lent too ready an ear to the alarmists because their horror at the suggested profanation of the Sacrament was real. But the levelling influences of daily life had brought them to regard the Dissenters with kindlier feelings than did their leaders. A speech of the Queen early in the reign expressed this attitude well. "I hope," she had said, "that such of my subjects as have the misfortune to dissent from the Church of England will rest secure and satisfied in the Act of Toleration."[1] Excluding the periodical ebullitions of High Church fanaticism, Dissent and Establishment had followed this cue and lived together on very good terms. Presbyterianism, the most influential of Dissenting bodies, was fervently loyal and represented no great difference of doctrine.[2] Communion had been taken by

[1] *Parliamentary History*, Vol. VI., p. 144.

[2] For Presbyterians see Nottingham's Memorial of the State of England, 1705, in *Somers Tracts*, Vol. XII., pp. 539-545.

Presbyterians and members of other bodies at the parish church,[1] and the basis of establishment had been considerably broadened. This had been going on ever since 1662, directed by "some of the most eminent of our ministers with a design to show their charity towards that Church (of England), notwithstanding they apprehended themselves bound in conscience ordinarily to separate from it."[2] The Church was strengthened in proportion as Nonconformity was weakened. This was widely recognised, and in both the Houses of Parliament and in the country at large the advantages of Toleration were praised. "The Toleration hath had such visible and good effects, hath contributed so much to the security and reputation of the Church of England, and produced so good a temper amongst the Dissenters that the Lords are unwilling to give the least discredit to that Act, being sensible that liberty of conscience and gentle measures are most proper and have been most effectual towards

[1] See Nottingham's Memorial of the State of England, 1705, in *Somers Tracts*, Vol. XII., p. 553.

[2] *Calamy's Life*, Vol. I., p. 473.

increasing the Church and diminishing the number of Dissenters."[1]

Before this body of opinion the Occasional Conformity Bill succumbed. The High Fliers made great efforts to force the Lords to pass it. Their last attempt was to try and tack it to a Money Bill. They were forced to withdraw the measure, for the influence of Marlborough in 1705 was omnipotent, and he had declared no mercy to the supporters of "the tack."[2] The Tories incurred much discredit by their relentless hostility to the Dissenters. Toleration slowly gained ground with the gradual transformation of the Tory Ministry of Anne's first Parliament to the Whig Ministry she dissolved in 1710. But the more Toleration was identified with the Whig party the more it fell into public disfavour. It supplied a forcible argument to the cry, "The Church in Danger," and it became the most unpopular of a series of unpopular policies. When the High Church party was returned to power it revenged the defeat it had formerly suffered, and passed the Occasional Conform-

[1] *Parliamentary History*, Vol. VI., pp. 77-8.
[2] *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. V., p. 464.

ity Act of 1711 and the Schism Act of 1713. Toleration was rejected by the hierarchical High Fliers, but it was not dead. It lived in a dormant state in the moderate portion of the Church, but when the position of 1710-14 became untenable, Toleration once more flourished. Under the influence of Rationalism Toleration relapsed into the quietism and unenlightened indifference of the eighteenth century.

III.

The chief strength of the High Church position lay in its democratical nature. The age of Anne witnessed a spiritual revival, which in combination with the political activities of the Church was all powerful. The moderate portion of the Church, distinct from both parties, was occupied in the Evangelical movement, an activity at first alien to the main activities in the Church, but afterwards swept up in them, wholly incorporated and reinvigorated. Synchronous with all the "unseemly wrangling"[1] of the reigns of William

[1] Hutton, *History of English Church*, p. 304.

and of Anne there was an earnest attempt to vivify religion, to bring it in touch with men and affairs, and to try to lessen the reproach offered by the many obvious gaps in the Church's work. The attempt was made at first independent of the battles of the High Church and Low Church parties. The all-pervading desire for the exaltation of the Church, which characterised the High Churchmen, and the desire for true religion in the Church, which characterised the Evangelists, soon became identified. Evangelicalism balanced fanaticism, and became the main support of the High Church party.

The origins and antecedents of the Evangelical movement can be traced far back. In a sense it is a child of Puritanism, and its history can be made co-terminous with that movement. But in the form with which it has to be dealt with here it is a distinct product of the Revolution. "It is certain that a vigorous moral reaction within, accompanied that exterior dynastic revolution."[1] The form which the reaction took was dictated by previous and similar efforts. In the reign of Charles II.

[1] Mark Pattison, *Essays*, Vol. II. p. 311.

societies of young men had clustered round the ministry of some eminent divine.[1]

These societies stood as a reproach to the moral depravity which had been shamelessly flaunted before the country by the court of the restored King. This influence for evil did not penetrate far; it was superficial for the most part, and takes its most enduring form in the drama of the age. But it was scandalous and public. The indignation and disgust roused by the prevalence of vice in high places, coupled with the fear and alarm consequent on the discoveries of Titus Oates, were the immediate causes of the societies, which came into existence somewhere about 1678.[2] Their object was mutual edification and help in devotion and works of piety. They survived through the perilous times of James II. by remaining in quiet and silence. By Anne's reign, though they had degenerated into mere Church societies, they had outlived the prejudices they had at first suffered from, and

[1] Burnet, *History of his own Times*, Vol. VI., p. 17, and Woodward, *Account of the Religious Societies*, p. 75 (1701).

[2] Burnet says that formerly such organisations were only run by Dissenters, and originated from fear of Popery (*History of his own Times*, Vol. VI., p. 18).

they could count on the support of the leaders of the churches and of most of the men of piety in that age.

These societies are clearly indicative that zeal for reform and desire to make religion real were not wanting in the Church. They represent, however, individual effort, and, in a sense, selfish effort. It is a distinct step in advance when philanthropy becomes an actuating motive of organisation. The formation of societies for the Reformation of Manners shows the result of the good the preparatory religious associations had done, and also the acuter recognition of obligations. These societies were established to help the carrying out of the proclamation of William in 1692 against immorality and vice.[1] They wished to bring home the terror of the law to evil doers.

Their authorities for action were Royal Proclamations, Acts of Parliament against profanity and impious and unclean books, censures and representations of Convocations on the state of manners, and outspoken attacks

[1] In Wilkins' *Concilia*, Vol. IV., pp. 615, 617, 626, are specimens of other proclamations.

on flagrant immorality, as Jeremy Collier's "Short view of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage." They showed great activity, and in forty-two years of existence the London Branch could proudly point to the prosecution of 100,650 persons.[1] The leaders were for the most part laymen, yet the society's work received the support and assistance of many of the eminent clergy.[2] The work was recommended in provincial and diocesan addresses, and branches were formed in the various towns and additional lectures were established. Dissent as well as Establishment joined in this matter of the common weal.[3] The reports of the main society are eloquent of the extent of the nature of the work they were doing, but they also show the weak point of their attack on the current corruption of manners.

[1] Report of the London Society for the Reformation of Manners, 1736. There is a typical case in Luttrell, Vol. VI., p. 102: "The Society for the Reformation of Manners have brought an indictment against twenty-four actors in the playhouse for immorality and prophanesse upon which they are to be tried this term."

[2] Compton published in 1704 "Report of 11th Conference with his clergy, held in the years 1699 and 1700 upon the King's Proclamation for preventing Immorality and Prophanesse."

[3] It was for this reason that they were condemned by Archbishop Sharp. See his *Life*, Vol. I., pp. 174-183.

To enforce the vigour of the law of the country against vice was the object of these societies; as yet there had been few attempts to display the attractiveness of the law of the Church. Philanthropic effort was as yet misguided and to a great extent wasted. In the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge there were combined all the good intentions of previous societies with a distinctly new object. This society attempted to teach, to educate, and to edify. The guiding spirit of the society was Dr. Thomas Bray, whose personal history and ambitions are an essential part of the philanthropic efforts of the reign.

Dr. Bray[1] in 1696 had been appointed Commissary of the Bishop of London in Maryland. He found the colonies almost destitute of clergy, and without provision for their rapidly growing needs. In selecting assistants he was faced with the additional difficulty that many clergymen were too poor to buy the books necessary for ordinary study. This had led him to form an association for founding libraries. These temporary endeavours took a finished and permanent form in the new

[1] See D.N.B.

society. The society first met on March 8th, 1699, and consisted of five members, of whom four were laymen.[1] Their object was "to meet together as often as we can conveniently to consult, under the conduct of the Divine providence and assistance, how we may be able by due and lawful methods to promote Christian Knowledge."[2] These methods were the establishment of charity schools and the circulation of libraries of religious books. The first object was doubtless an attempt to emulate the Dissenters, who were much ahead of the Church in educational organisation.[3] The second object and the third, afterwards added — of missionary effort — were the favourite schemes of Bray.

The Charity Schools were "for the education of poor children in reading and writing, and more especially in the principles of the Christian religion."[4] They were a great success, and in about eight years nearly five hundred were established.[5] It is interesting

[1] Overton, *Life in English Church*, p. 216.

[2] Secretan, *Life and Times of Nelson*, p. 100 (Ed. 1860).

[3] Lecky, *History of England*, Vol. I., pp. 118, 119.

[4] *History of the S.P.C.K.*, 1698-1898.

[5] Secretan, *Life and Times of Nelson*, pp. 118-134, and Overton, pp. 226-227.

to recall the fact that in Germany almost at the same time August Hermann Francke was starting his great work of school foundation and improvement.[1] The English movement was a great source of strength to the Church. Church teaching was insisted upon and the catechising of children was organised and largely adopted by the clergy.[2]

Through the influence of the society daily prayer and monthly communions were rendered a prominent feature of Church life. Tracts were distributed and the problem of the navy's religious condition seriously tackled.[3] A pleasing feature of the Society was the manner in which it sought for the counsels of all parties.[4] Non-jurors and suspected deists sunk their differences in its work. As a result there is a refreshing

[1] *Special Reports on Educational Subjects*, Vol. xx., p. 10, issued by Board of Education; *The Teaching of Classics in Secondary Schools in Germany*, 1910.

[2] Burnet frequently conducted the catechising of Salisbury (Pattison, Vol. II., p. 236). See Luttrell, VI., p. 309—"This day the children of the several Charity Schools in the city and suburbs, all new clothed, being about 4,000, went to St. Sepulchre's Church, where Dr. Mosse preached upon the occasion."

[3] For work of the Society see *Jubilee Tract* of 1849.

[4] Overton, p. 217.

breadth of originality about the designs of the society. Insular prejudices were undermined by its willing co-operation with foreign Protestants working towards similar ends.[1] "The reformation of manners . . . so good in itself and so necessary for the welfare of the community,"[2] made great progress towards realisation.

In its work of providing missionaries for the colonies, the society found that it was getting beyond its depth. Missionary effort was too great for its limitations, and accordingly on January 16th, 1701, a charter was granted incorporating the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Its promoters were actuated by a consideration of the state of the lands over the sea—"by their want of the administration of God's Word and Sacraments," and by "their abandonment to atheism and infidelity."[3] The title these men adopted was no new one. Cromwell and Clarendon had both used a similar name

[1] Anderson, *History of the Colonial Church*, Vol., II., p. 409.
[2] Nelson, *Life of Bull*, p. 312.
[3] See *Charter of the Society*, p. 15; collection of papers printed by order of the S.P.G. (1702).

for societies they had promoted.[1] The task they proposed to attempt called for immediate attention. Religion was of a lax, lifeless kind in the colonies, and Christianity had, with few exceptions, never been preached to the heathen. The only attempts heretofore had been those of enterprising Jesuits. Protestantism seemed a delicate plant which refused to flower outside parts of Europe. The pure Church of England seemed to defy attempts of transplantation. Where Christianity flourished at all in the colonies it had taken the form of a scattered, tyrannical independency. The traditions of the New England Colonies were too strong and divided to view the propagation of the Church of Laud with any favour. Clergy were few—mostly of an inferior kind and altogether without direction or guidance.[2]

The position was to all appearances hopeless, but the enthusiasm of the Evangelical movement viewed it only as a glorious oppor-

[1] *The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel among the Indians and others in N. America*, pp. 5 and 6 (1787-1887), Boston, 1887.

[2] Hawkins, *Historical Notices of the Missions of the Church of England in the North American Colonies*, p. 166.

tunity. As Archbishop Laud[1] had been the first to recognise the responsibility of the Church, so the re-invigorated Church of Anne's reign made the first sound organised attempts to fulfil her obligations. In the interval of nearly seventy years there had been a considerable amount of scattered and individual effort. It was the last and perhaps the greatest of these that was merged into the society. The labours and writings of Dr. Bray directed public attention to the state of affairs and called for union of effort. His *Memorial of the State of Religion in America*, published in January, 1701, was followed by the foundation of the new society in June. It met with ready support, and funds were quickly gathered together for the maintenance of orthodox clergy who were to minister to the needs of colonists and natives alike.[2] America bestirred itself and Virginia

[1] See *Life of Laud*, by Heylin (1668), Part ii., Liber iv., pp. 274-276.

[2] Evelyn, *Memoirs*, Vol. ii., p. 77 (Ed. 1819), 3rd May, 1702. "Being elected a member of the Society lately incorporated for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, subscribed £10 per annum towards the carrying it on. We agreed that every Missioner, beside the £20 to set him forth, should have £50 per annum out of the stock of the Corporation till his settlement was worth to him £100 per annum. We sent a young Divine to New York."

attempted self-reorganisation.[1] The idea of the See of Canterbury as a patriarchate over many Sees was a possible ideal, and a scheme for the endowment of four bishoprics in America was in progress when Anne died.[2] In the ensuing complications enthusiasm for such work in England almost disappeared.

The colonies did not absorb the whole interest of the new movement. The missionary spirit roused lived up to its motto—"Go, teach all nations." In 1710 it was determined by the society that in future its main work would be the "conversion of heathen and infidels."[3] Missions were sent to the American Indians and to the West Indies.[4] Work in India was not undertaken till much later. The great difficulty was to obtain volunteers for mission service and to secure bishops to supervise their labours. Foreign Missions in the present sense of the term were a too advanced state of philanthropy to meet with much encourage-

[1] *Calendars of State Papers, America and West Indies, for* 1700, p. 244. "Bill for establishing Religion ordered to be committed to the care of Dr. Bray to be sent to England.

[2] Hawkins, pp. 380-3.

[3] See *History of S.P.C.K.*, 1698-1898.

[4] *Report of the Bicentenary Celebrations of the S.P.G.*, 1900-1 (pp. 29-31).

ment. They were a repellingly arduous task, and prominent men excused the indifference of the Church towards the subject by suggesting that supernatural powers were needed for such work.[1] Still the germ of missions was there, and some kind of foundation had been laid for the subsequent rapid and wonderful progress.

These societies are the more definitely organised forms which the Evangelical movement took. They were supplemented and accompanied by a more diffused interest in the Church's life and aim and in the condition of the clergy themselves. The desire for a better standard of morals was quickened by the establishment and success of periodical literature. One of the objects of such papers as the *Spectator* and the *Tatler* is distinctly in this category. The hypocrisies of society life, the extremes of opinion, and the faults and foibles of the average man were subjected to the lash of satirical criticism which, in many cases, was so much more cutting because it was so refined and polished. The drinking

[1] Abbey, *The English Church and its Bishops*, 1700-1800, Vol. I., p. 88.

in the clubs, coffee-houses and city taverns, the vice of gaming,[1] and the popularity of the sports of cock-fighting and bear-baiting were satirised in the light of an advanced spirit. These attempts at inculcating a higher tone had a decidedly good effect.

But something more than satire was required when the problem of the clergy was examined. There is abundant evidence proving the poverty of the clergy and their low social status. Restoration drama, for instance, is full of sneers and hits at the clergy.[2] Their learning, too, was despised—"His learning is much of a size with his birth and education, no more of either than what a poor hungry servitor can be expected to bring with him from his college."[3] The small income of many benefices was but poorly compensated by the practice of pluralities. A more uncertain source of income was found in private benevolence, which often took the form of domestic chaplaincies.[4] This poverty, along

[1] Luttrell notices (Vol. VI., p. 282), "A prosecution for gaming on Sundays."

[2] Cf. Vanburgh's *The Provoked Wife.*

[3] Swift's *Considerations on two Bills relating to the Clergy of Ireland*, 1731, Vol. VIII., p. 424.

[4] See *Calamy's Life*, pp. 217-219.

with the existing confusion of Church and State, was the cause of the widely practised art of preferment hunting. The most tempting baits were offered for the services of a clever divine. Swift, despite his real rooted affection for the Church, was always dominated by the thought of the mitre that one day was to be his. The ideal country clergyman of Herbert may have existed, but by far the commoner type was the poor chaplain Swift has described, and the poor amiable Tory Churchmen Addison has pictured in the *Spectator*.[1]

Macaulay, in a famous passage, has emphasised this side of the Church.[2] Following "*Eachred's Complaint*, he has dwelt over much on the clergy's poverty, ignorance, and despised social position. This view has been relaxed somewhat on closer study, and Macaulay's exaggerations have been toned down to sober facts.[3] But even then there is a strong case

[1] Addison, *Spectator*, p. 106.

[2] *History*, Vol. I. (Ed. 1861), Chap. iii., pp. 326-334

[3] Mr. Babington has carefully examined the facts of the case, and though he has shewn that Macaulay has relied too much on Eachred, he has not destroyed the main lines of Macaulay's position.

to be be made out against the clergy. It was this disadvantage which prevented them from becoming dictators in the country. Poor they were — the establishment of Queen Anne's bounty among other things shows that, — ignorant they were on the whole—Dr. Bray's library scheme proves the need of reform in this direction, but influential the country clergy were to a wonderful degree. The quickening spirit of controversy and strife precipitated a loyalty to the Church which gained them ever a respectful hearing and on which they were not slow to improve.

This strong clerical influence manifested itself in strict ecclesiastical work. The age of Anne was a time of much church-building and restoration. In London the need for churches was great, and a scheme for the building of fifty was inaugurated, besides the completion of Wren's great work—St. Paul's Cathedral.[1] Parliament voted £350,000 for the churches, but the money was got through before more than twelve were built. Parliament also announced that the applications of

[1] St. Paul's was finished in 1710—in which year also the Act of Parliament for the churches was passed.

the clergy in Convocation would be received with particular regard.[1] But their invitation met with little response. Besides the activities mentioned above, the clergy exhibited so petulant and trivial a spirit when their party was in power, that they went far to undermine their own predominance. In one department, however, they exhibited great activity. Devotional exercises flourished and were a notable feature of the Church history of the reign. Sermons were popular in the extreme, and those of well-known divines when published ran into many editions.[2] Pure devotional works, like those of Nelson, Frampton and Hickes, speak well for the piety of the non-jurors and testify to the loss the Church sustained through that schism.

It is the full workings of this powerful revival that brought about the High Church triumph of 1710. The religious life of the country—its philanthropic effort—its spirituality—definitely committed itself to the High Church and Tory interest. The seeming contrast between the sharp controversial spirit

[1] *Parliamentary History*, Vol. VI., p. 1005.

[2] Funeral sermons were common at this time, and some very famous eulogies were delivered.

of the High Fliers and the wealth of religious effort in the country is really non-existant. They are but different expressions of the same progressive spirit. The movement was towards the establishment of a strong hierarchy based on the democratised High Church party. The whole trend of affairs since the martyrdom of the blessed Charles had been to grapple the Church and the people together with almost indissoluble bonds. Under the favourable conditions of Anne's reign this close contact became alarmingly apparent. Authority and orthodoxy triumphed over dissent and schism. The religious and dynastic settlements of the revolution were threatened, when these seemingly all-powerful movements collapsed and a new set of tendencies took up the race.

IV.

Before the reasons for this collapse are examined, the history of Convocation must be glanced at, as completing the history of the struggle for power between the two parties. In the history of the clerical assembly we find

reflected and intensified the tendencies of the country. The smaller surface makes the main lines stand out clearer, and the detail and complexity of the whole is reduced to a welcome lucidity. Convocation had, in 1664, given up their old time privilege of taxing themselves and agreed to being included in the Money Bills of the House of Commons.[1] They had thus lost their chief claim to independence, for their performance of business had, since the Act of Submission, rested solely on royal licence. James II., in view of his antagonistic policy to the Church, had taken care to prevent any corporate criticism. William had empowered Convocation at the beginning of his reign to revise the Prayer Book, but as the purpose was the "Comprehension" of Presbyterians, the Lower House of Convocation had proved unruly and had been dissolved. William had been careful not to provoke another rebuff, and Convocation had met and adjourned till 1701.

In 1697 "A letter to a Convocation Man" asserted from a High Church and Jacobite point of view the rights, powers and privileges

[1] Lathbury, *History of Convocation*, p. 308.

of Convocation. The plagues which "followed the wind that blew from Holland" were taken as justifying the attitude adopted.[1] Infidelity, Socinianism and anti-Trinitarianism were rapidly growing stronger. The chief claim of the pamphlet was that Convocation and Parliament, while both assembled by royal writ, were possessed exactly of the same privileges.[2] It was answered by Dr. Wake in *The Authority of Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods asserted.* From this beginning the Convocation controversy assumed great dimensions. Much antiquarianism was wasted in the probing of obscure points, and much bitterness was instilled into the already sharp divisions of the Church.

In the reign of Queen Anne, the practical result of this dispute was the intense antagonism of the two Houses. The Lower House, strongly Tory and High Church, wished to elevate their proceedings and to use their right of assembly as an effective weapon in the propagation of their opinions. Naturally

[1] "Letter to a Convocation Man," *Somers Tracts*, Vol. IX., p. 412.

[2] Ibid., pp. 421-422.

enough the Whig Bishops sought for some means of silencing them. This was found in the right of Prorogation at will which the Archbishop claimed to possess. The claim provoked another series of pamphlets, and the quarrel grew apace.

The history of Convocation must be briefly sketched with reference to the main lines in the period. In the first sitting of the new Convocation, in November, 1702, the Lower House, provoked by Archbishop Tenison's re-assertion of his right of Prorogation, asked that the question be submitted to the Queen.[1] The bishops asked the Lower House not to forget the episcopal nature of the Church and the reverence due to them. Meanwhile the Tory House of Commons resolved that they would "on all occasions assert the just rights and privileges of the Lower House of Convocation."[2] Following this triumph, the Lower House asked the bishops to give their approval to a resolution they had passed declaring that the order of bishops was of divine apostolical institution, and calling upon them

[1] Calamy, Vol. I., pp. 635-637.
[2] Quoted by Hutton, *History of English Church*, Vol. VI.

to condemn Arian and Erastian opinion.[1] The bishops were in a difficult position, "For if they complied with the Lower House they gained their point, and if they refused it they resolved to make them who would not come up to such a positive definition pass for secret favourers of Presbytery."[2] The point was eluded by the Archbishop declaring that they had no authority to make such a declaration without royal licence.

In the first session the Lower House had complained of the licentiousness of the press, and in another paper of the inefficiency of the laws as to Church rates. In the second session in the spring of 1703, they complained in a long paper of the canons, of remissness in presentation of children for baptism, of irregularities in marriages, and other defects in the spiritual life of the Church.[3] This was the occasion, Burnet says, that "they took care to mention none of those greater ones of which so many among themselves are eminently

[1] This may have been done by the Lower House to give the lie to the slander that they were enemies of episcopacy. *Atterbury's Memoirs and Correspondence*, Vol. II., pp. 29-30.

[2] Burnet, *History of his own Times*, Vol. v., pp. 80-9.

[3] Lathbury, p. 384.

guilty, such as pluralities, non-residence, the neglect of their cures, and the irregularities in the lives of the clergy which were too visible."[1] Their complaints were noticed by the bishops and used in visitations.[2]

Convocation met for the third time with Parliament in the Autumn of 1704 and the old disputes were continued. The Lower House complained of the little benefit derived from its meetings, and rightly assigned the cause to the want of harmony existing between the two Houses. The Lower House also complained of some reflections Burnet had made on it in a Visitation Charge.[3] In the Convocation of October, 1705, the Lower House refused to concur in the Upper House's Address to the Queen.[4] In the recess a protest against the proceedings of the Lower House was signed by more than fifty members.[5] The next session was characterised by a letter from the Queen

[1] Burnet, *History of his own Times*, Vol. v., p. 140.

[2] Lathbury, p. 385.

[3] Lathbury, p. 394.

[4] Burnet speaks of the clergy on this occasion "as soured beyond what could be imagined possible," and says that "the generality of the clergy were not only ill-principled but ill-tempered." Vol. v., p. 139.

[5] Beeching, *Life of Atterbury*, pp. 111, 112.

on the difficulties of the situation. The Lower House also drew up a long letter to the bishops complaining of certain books and writings. Some periodicals were condemned and the theatre was censured for immoral practices. The meeting of Unitarians was thought omnious, as were the proposals for foreign adoption of the British Liturgy, while a sermon of Benjamin Hoadley was called dishonourable to the Church, containing as it did positions contrary to the doctrines of the Church as expressed in the homily against disobedience and wilful rebellion.[1]

In 1707 both Houses joined in acknowledging the safety the Church enjoyed under Anne's rule, but as the Government apprehended opposition to their Scotch Union Bill a prorogation followed.[2] In their next session this was protested against in such vehement terms and was accompanied by such antagonism that Convocation was not allowed the Royal License to transact business at the next meeting of Parliament.[3]

In November, 1709, Dr. Sacheverell preached

[1] Wilkins, *Concilia*, Vol. IV., pp. 633-4.
[2] *Luttrell's Diary*, Vol. VI., p. 115.
[3] Lathbury, p. 402.

his famous sermon, and a few months after the Tories were borne by public favour into power. The Queen's Letter of Business to the new Convocation of 1710 amounted to a liberal invitation to do their best for the Church.[1] Little was done. The Lower House occupied itself under Atterbury as Prolocutor with censuring the works of Whiston, as being "directly opposite to the fundamental articles of the Christian Church."[2]

Whether this condemnation was possible or no occupied their attention, and except the projects for church building[3] the Convocation did nothing remarkable. In 1711 Atterbury created a deadlock by claiming the full force that could be given to a prorogation of Convocation by analogy from the prorogation of the Commons.[4]

In 1714 there was a dispute over the Address, though Atterbury, the leading figure of the former disputes, had now a place in the

[1] Wilkins, *Concilia*, Vol. IV., p. 638.

[2] Ibid., pp. 646, et seq.

[3] Atterbury, *Correspondence*, Vol. II., pp. 312-314, and *History of Parliament and Convocation*, pp. 134-138 (1711).

[4] Lathbury, p. 418, and "The Mitre and the Crown," *Somers Tracts*, Vol. XII., p. 602.

Upper House.[1] The Houses made their Addresses separately and then proceeded to the discussion of matters named in the Queen's Letter of 1711. The question of Trinitarianism was occupying their attention, and more especially Samuel Clarke's work, when Anne died.[2] In the following reign the Tory nature of the Lower House so alarmed the Whigs that they prorogued it indefinitely and its meetings lapsed until modern times. Occupied in academic strife the revived Convocation of Anne exhibited in an unmistakable way the evils of the connection between Church and State. Its sole good work had been of an incidental nature, and even then had been in no way constructive. Protests and censures had occupied Convocation's time.

V.

The doctrines of divine right and passive obedience had never been surrendered by the Church. The revolution settlement had been acquiesced in, but the non-juror schism had been formed and the story of the Old Preten-

[1] Lathbury, p. 424.
[2] Wilkins, *Concilia*, Vol. IV., pp. 651-659.

der's fictitious birth formulated. The Church did not accept William as King de jure, and the process of the de facto right growing into the de jure one broke down at the accession of Anne. She, at least, was of the proper stock even though her half-brother had a better title. The strictest upholders of direct hereditary succession, the non-jurors, viewed her with favour, and, encouraged by her supposed favour to the pretensions of the young Prince, "began to look out of their quiet nooks to see what this gleam of sunshine might promise."[1] Anne, indeed, was only prevented from recognising the Pretender because she was never allowed to forget that he was a papist and an enemy to the Church she loved. The mass of the country had no such conscience soothers as the Whig Bishops were to the Queen, and they drifted far along this stream in the wake of the Jacobite High Churchmen.

These High Fliers, actuated mainly by the fear of the Whig supremacy which would follow the Hanoverian succession, began to plot for a Jacobite restoration. It was a design not widely known, Jacobitism itself was

[1] *Life of Ken*, by a Layman, p. 695.

widely diffused, but for the most part it was of the sentimental, romantic type, with such favourite expressions as drinking to the King over the water and toasting the "little black gentleman." With the clergy, the commonest form Jacobitism had taken was the careful observance of such dates as the 30th January, the 7th September, the birthday of Queen Elizabeth, and the 5th of November.[1] Inflammatory sermons were preached on these occasions, and the opportunity was taken of further emphasising the danger the Church was in from all Whig counsels. In reality, Jacobitism was an atmosphere rather than a potential reality. The Jacobite plot at the end of the reign was an unformed thing in the dark. There was never anything more on the part of the general public than a vague feeling of dislike to the Hanoverian party. Even to some prominent men of the Tory party the plot was unknown. Swift, for instance, knew nothing of the design and wrote against it.[2]

[1] Sacheverell's Sermon was a 5th of November one.

[2] The pamphlet *Some Free Thoughts upon the Present State of Affairs* shows clearly that he himself was no Jacobite and had little sympathy with and apparently no knowledge of the Jacobite plot. Also in No. 16 of the *Examiner* he strongly denounced the hints Whig papers made that the Tories were supporting the Pretender. Vol. IV., pp. 35-38.

But with Bolingbroke, Ormond and Atterbury, it was otherwise. As leaders of the extreme Tory party they cast about in despair for the prolonging of their power. They saw no hope of this from Hanover, and so they staked all on a Stuart restoration. They glossed over insurmountable difficulties. In 1711 an English Jacobite wrote to a friend as follows: "Anything that tends towards Jacobitism sounds ill in the ears of those who are always used to tack popery, slavery, and arbitrary government together, and have no other notion of a popish king but that of a bigot tyrant."[1] The days of James II. could never be forgotten. The religion of the Pretender was sufficient to make him odious to the country: coupled with his repudiation of the national debt, *inter alia*, it made his chance hopeless.[2] Addison's epigram was well merited by these men, "The Church of England will always be in danger till it has a popish king for its defender."[3] Bolingbroke, it is true, tried to get James to grant more than "reasonable security" for the Protestant religion, but failed

[1] Macpherson, *Original Papers*, Vol. II., p. 122.
[2] *Stuart MSS.*, Vol. I., Introduction, pp. liv., lv.
[3] *Freeholder*, 14.

to get his signature to a document renouncing his Church.[1] That was in the autumn of 1713. In June, 1714, Bolingbroke was willing to accept James without any conditions.[2]

What might have happened if the Jacobite plot had matured is beyond speculation. One thing is certain, the Church could not have accepted the Pretender on the conditions he offered, even if Anne had felt bound to recognise his claims. As it was the Church party was sufficiently compromised to fall into entire disfavour with the new dynasty. The impeachment of the Tory ministers in 1715 and the flight of the prominent Jacobites meant the ruin of the Tory party. The country acquiesced in George's accession, and James was content with publishing a Declaration claiming the three kingdoms.[3]

This Jacobitism of the Tory leaders is the immediate cause of the failure of the High Church party to prolong its position of 1710-14. It is the last attempt of the Church of Laud to establish as a permanence the favourable

[1] *Stuart MSS.*, Introduction, pp. liii., liv.

[2] Ibid. For James' refusal to change his religion see Macpherson, *Original Papers*, Vol. II., p. 525,

[3] *Stuart Papers*, Vol. I., p. 333.

conditions of the policy of Strafford. The Church of Anne failed in its attempt to rule the country solely in the interests of the Church. The force of constitutional government was too strong. The Cabinet, not the Church, was to be all-important in the future. In a like manner the intellectual and theological despotism of the Church was overthrown by a philosophy which appealed to reason, not to dogma.

VI.

Rationalism was a convenient label given to the movements against the claim to exercise a despotic control over the intellect of the individual which the old intellectual systems had hitherto exerted. "Whatever is lost by Catholicism is gained by Rationalism," and the origins of the rebellion can be traced to the Reformation. The English Church settlement followed the old lines of theological thought, which put forth its last efforts at supremacy during Anne's reign. To do this it had for the time being arrested the development of Tolerance and

discredited the mitigating influence of Latitudinarianism. Locke in his "Essay on the Reasonableness of Christianity" led the attack on the system of theology adopted by the Church, and like Nietzche, in a later age, questioned what had formerly been considered axiomatic.

The philosophy inaugurated by Locke wished to test—by the application of pure reason—doctrines which had been immune from such enquiry owing to the sacredness in which they were veiled.[1] Rationalism was an atmospheric condition rather than a scholastic. Unconsciously everybody attempted the justification of the doctrines they held by the criterion of reason. The criterion of reason was not opposed to revealed religion and sought to distinguish carefully between the natural and supernatural in religion. There was a slavish adherence to the text of the Bible—the quarrel Rationalism had was with Creeds. Dr. Thomas Gurnel's *Archaeologiae Philosophicae*, which treated the account of Adam and Eve and Paradise as Eastern fables teaching moral truths was considered by the

[1] See Locke's Essay, *passim*.

age as being a far greater heresy than defying the Trinity or mutilating the Creeds.[1]

The attempt at first was made to shew that the old doctrines were based on reason. "Nothing is revealed in Christianity," was the thesis, "which is opposed to reason." Later the drift of thought was to test and examine critically the story of the New Testament. The divisions in Rationalism correspond roughly to the two halves of the century.[2] In the first half writers were occupied with the internal study of Christianity: and the controversies which centred round the points raised, formed the portion of Rationalism which overthrew the foundation of the High Church party. Evangelicalism was in a sense a rebellion against the philosophic spirit, but the Evangelical movement succumbed. It was only when released from dogma that Evangelicalism flourished, and even the Wesleyan revival was forced to acquiesce somewhat in the century's trend of thought.

The dominant controversy of the reign of Anne was that of the Deists. It was by no

[1] Hunt, *Religious Thought in England*, Vol. II., p. 223.
[2] Pattison, *Essays*, Vol. II., p. 47.

means confined to that reign, it was all-absorbing during the whole of the first half of the century, reaching its height just before Hume contributed to it his *Treatise of Human Nature* (1736). This controversy examined the question of how far was natural religion sufficient. Natural religion, according to the Deists, was the result of a closely reasoned and logical process. This was the basis adopted by all theologians. Christians, however, declared that reason, in addition to detecting this natural religion, could also pass on to detect the truths of revealed religion by an extension of the same process. Natural law, the Deists said, was all-sufficient. Toland's book, *Christianity not Mysterious*[1] and Chubb's *Enquiry into the Foundation of Religion*,[2] stripped Christianity of anything holy or impressive. It was useless to advance the mystical element in religion against such works, for mystery is not open to reason, and is far from logical. This undue application of reason resulted again in the work of Shaftes-

[1] For Toland see Leslie Stephen, *History of English Thought in 18th century*, Vol. I., pp. 101-119.

[2] Ibid, pp. 161-165.

bury, who, in his *Characteristics*, assailed all positive doctrine and declared himself opposed to all enthusiasm. He laid emphasis on disinterested morality, existing independent of creed, and prior to revealed Christianity. In this view Christianity became nothing more than a re-issue of the moral law. The question Shaftesbury raised attracted some attention, and it was the subject of contention between Atterbury and Hoadley.

More speculative theology possessed similar characteristics. King's book on the Origin of Evil, and his sermon on Predestination are good examples. He applied reason to these problems, and came to the conclusion that the old Calvinistic doctrines of the wisdom and foreknowledge of God could only be described "by way of resemblance and analogy."[1] The principles of Collins' essay on the *Use of Reason* were later elaborated into his *Discourse on Free-thinking:* that Reason is the gift of God, and anything irrational cannot come from God is his principle, and he unhesitatingly applies it to all Christianity. The Free-thinker—the man who uses his reason to its

[1] *History of English Thought in 18th Century*, Vol. I., p. 114.

full advantage — is the worst enemy of Infidelity.[1] Their solicitude for the Church and Religion was the most dangerous weapon that the Deists had.

They did not wholly confine their attacks to the theology of the Church. The attacks of the Deists on the clergy were led by Collins. In his *Rights of the Church vindicated against Romish and other Priests* (1706) and his *Priestcraft in Perfection*[2] were embodied denunciations of the position and pretensions of the clergy. Similar accusations are found in Sir R. Howard's *History of Religion as managed by Priestcraft* and in Toland's *Letters to Serena and the Tribe of Levi.* The lead was well followed, and the cry of priestcraft was taken up by numerous pamphleteers. The Deists clung tenaciously to their positions, but it was in vain. There were no real grounds for the accusation of priestcraft against the mass of the clergy.

In a brief review it is impossible to do the Deists full justice. Only the barest facts can

[1] Hunt, *Religious Thought in England*, Vol. II., p. 374.

[2] *Somers Tracts*, Vol. XII., p. 159 and Vol. IX., p. 590, Reflections on a late pamphlet entitled *Priestcraft and Perfection.*

be stated and only the broadest generalisations offered. It is sufficient for the purpose here to have indicated the "newness" of the revolutionary element of this controversy. Often sheltering within the folds of the Church, for many Deists called themselves Christian Deists,[1] these writers attacked the core of Christianity. They demoralised by their philosophy the old theology. Faith was tabooed, enthusiasm was suspected, reason alone held sway. Deism was undoubtedly the most successful form of Rationalism.

The second controversy in which the first half of the Rationalistic movement found expression is known as the Arian controversy. It was led by such men as Emlyn, Whiston and Clarke. Whiston's book was *An Historical Preface to Primitive Christianity Reviewed.* He was an able mathematician of Cambridge, who was led into manifest Arianism by his desire to place the theories about the Trinity before men in a plain and understandable fashion. "For these tenets he was censured at Cambridge and expelled the University. Upon that he wrote a vindication of himself

[1] Toland and Collins called themselves Christian Deists.

and his doctrine and dedicated it to Convocation."[1] Convocation censured his book. Whiston, who held, in his own opinion, no position antagonistic to the Church, submitted. But he was afterwards forced to resign his professorship at Cambridge and to leave the Church.

Emlyn's faith in the accepted doctrine of the Trinity was shaken by reading, soon after his ordination, Dr. Sherlock's book on the Trinity. His ministry in Dublin was characterised by no definite teaching of creeds. His orthodoxy was suspected and he was pressed to resign his position.[2] He then published *A Humble Enquiry into the Deity of Jesus Christ*, in which he asserted that the supreme God is above Jesus Christ. For this he was convicted of blasphemy, imprisoned and fined. His books called forth a crowd of answering works. The first direct refutation was the work of a Dublin pastor, Joseph Boyse.

Samuel Clarke's work was wide and comprehensive, though not possessed of much

[1] Burnet, *History of his own Times*, Vol. VI., p. 49.
[2] Hunt, Vol. II., p. 325.

originality.[1] He was greatly concerned in constructing a theology from first principles on strict logical lines. His metaphysical deity was what he called nature—sometimes distinct from both God and man. From this position he fell into fundamental errors on the Trinity and exemplified the Rationalism of his age in his treatment of this doctrine. The case of Clarke and his works was pending the decision of the Houses of Convocation when Anne died.[2]

It is interesting to note that these three leading Arians arrived at their positions independently and differed in other views considerably. They were the product of Rationalism, and took up their respective attitudes to Christian theology mainly under its influence. A crowd of writers fought them, and the controversy raged far and wide. Most refutations are as Rationalistic as the provocations. It was dangerous to deny the efficacy of reason, for that would have been to deny what was to the eighteenth century the basis of all things.[3]

[1] Leslie Stephen, *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. I., p. 119.

[2] Wilkins' *Concilia*, Vol. IV., pp. 657-659.

[3] The application of reason for the purpose of ridicule is to be found in "A New Catechism with Dr. Hicks' Thirty-nine Articles" in *Somers Tracts*, Vol. XIII., p. 176.

One smaller heresy falls to be mentioned as showing the direct contact of High Church theology and the principles of Rationalism. The controversy of lay baptism[1] coincided with the fear of the High Church party that the Presbyterians and Latitudinarians were conspiring against the Church. Henry Dodwell raised the question as to the necessity for the re-baptism of Dissenters. Re-baptism was declared by the bishops to be unnecessary. At this declaration the High Church party took alarm, and they opposed the principle, going so far as to urge the repetition of the rite even when administered by laymen. The position was one incompatible with reason or toleration, and one only possible of adoption by a strong Church with all the tendencies of the age in its favour.

That the English Church had not the tendencies of the age in her favour has been made plain. Anne's reign, like all periods of history, is one of transition. In the political life of the country it meant the birth of the party system

[1] See Bingham, *Scholastical History of Lay Baptism* (Works, Ed. 1712), Vol. xi., especially Part ii., which contains "The State of the Present Controversy."

with its inter-dependence on the Protestant Succession. In the religious life it was a passing from the old to the new, with the new as yet unrecognisable and dim. It was an age of disillusionment, which was not suffered to pass without protest.

The gravest evil the Church suffered from was that of Establishment. The interests of Church and State were held to be the same. The Church was a political force, and strove after power in a manner unworthy of its professions. In the reign of Anne this political cancer of the Church became malignant. Following on the divisions raised by the Revolution, the High Churchmen of Anne's reign made a last splendid attempt to perpetuate their old-time power. They had great odds to contend against, but they had a great ally.

Against the Whig dominance of William's reign the Tories and High Churchmen did little. In the struggle they showed themselves in their worst light, fanatical party intriguers. Opposed to Toleration, hating the Dissenter with only a little less hatred than the Papist, the conduct of the High Church party during the reign of Queen Anne is the last and blackest

article in a long indictment against the connection of Church and State. The connection of the two led to corruption, decay and failure.

But while the Church put forth its might along the lines of absolutism and hierarchy, she was joined by an unexpected ally of great power. This was the revival of religion. Evangelicalism was full of good and noble works. Coupled with the political activity and power of the Church it was invincible. It supplied the necessary enthusiasm which politics could never give. It carried with it the great moderate element of the Church and the men who viewed the two parties of extremists with equal distaste. It was this combination of forces which represented the last attempt of the Church at establishing herself on the lines of her old theological and political theory.

The reign of Anne witnesses both the triumph and the failure of this attempt. The political energies of the Church degenerated into an impossible Jacobitism. The accepted mystical theology of the Church was attacked and discredited by Rationalism. Its enthusiam dying out the Church relapsed into the state in which it dragged out a dreary existence

in the eighteenth century. It was falling before the force of a general movement. Everywhere rebellion was made against authority. It is significant that Voltaire's visit to England was in the year 1724, when the Deistical controversy was at its height.

In France Jansenism relapsed, under the influence of the Spanish mysticism of St. Theresa, into quietism or gave way to Atheism or Infidelity. So the English Church, on the ruins of political disgrace and before the successful attack of the Zeitgeist, relapsed into the dead and soulless condition which was almost its only characteristic during a large portion of the eighteenth century. The quickening spirit of religious revival could not, after the catastrophe of 1714, find a satisfactory outlet for its energies within the pale of Establishment. Yet the followers of Wesley, while effecting a schism, reacted strongly on the Church. The Evangelical party in the Church was further strengthened by the reaction following the French Revolution. Religious life grew steadily deeper and more real, and in the Oxford Movement of the early nineteenth century can be seen the true heir

of the High Church revival of Queen Anne's reign. But the Oxford Movement was more than a century after the reign of Anne. It might have been far otherwise. Evangelicalism could have been an augury of the religion of the future. The Church could have looked upon Anne's reign as a clearing-house in which were left a series of shattered illusions and false hopes. The way would have been plain. Divorced from politics, purged of party spirit, with a theology in sympathy with the age, yet keeping a true proportion between the old mysterious elements and the new logical force of reason, she could have gone on her path with renewed youth. Democratised and knowing how to bind the people closer by a true Evangelicalism, not shirking her duty abroad, the Church gained, partially yet invaluably, from a political and temporary rebuff. The full harvest was deferred. That the ideal, at least, was rendered possible, that the way was cleared, that sundry dead and rotten branches were swept away, is the sum importance of the reign of Queen Anne in English Church History.

APPENDIX.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Section "A" contains a list of contemporary authorities for the period 1702—14.

Addison, Joseph, Works, ed. R. Hurd, Bishop of Worcester, 6 vols. London, 1854-6.
Anne, Queen, Memoirs of, by — Gibson. London, 1729.
Arbuthnot, John, Works, 2 vols. Glasgow, 1751.
Ashmole, Elias, Memoirs of, etc., by way of Diary. London, 1757.
——— The Way to Bliss. In Three Books. London, 1658.
Athenae Cantabrigienses, from Cole MSS. in British Museum. Addit. MSS. 5862-85, 5954, 5955.
Athenae Oxoniensis, Antony à Wood, new ed. with additions and a continuation by P. Bliss, 4 vols. London, 1813-20.
Athenian Oracle, 4 vols. London, 1728.
Atterbury, Francis, Bishop of Rochester, Memoirs and Correspondence of, ed. G. Folkestone Williams, 2 vols. 1869.
——— Sermons, 3 vols. London, 8th ed., 1706.
[For Bibliography of his works see Life, by Canon Beeching, pp. xv.-xviii.]
Bath, Marquis of. Longleat MSS. Hist. MSS. Report XV. London, 1904. Vol. I., 1904, vol. II., 1907, vol. III., 1908.
Berwick, Duke of, Memoirs. 2 vols. "En Suisse," 1778. Coll. Petitot, vols. LXV-VI.
Bingham, Joseph, Works, 12 vols. London, 1712.
Bolingbroke, Henry St. John, Viscount, Philosophical Works, ed. with Life, by David Mallet. London, 1754.
——— Letters and Correspondence with State Papers, ed. Gilbert Parke. London, 1798.
Boyer, Abel, History of Queen Anne. London, 1735.
[This is based on "The Annals of Queen Anne" (1703-13), renamed in 1713 "The Political state of Great Britain"].
Buccleuch and Queensbury, Duke of, Manuscripts, Hist. MSS. Commission Report XV. App. 8, 1897, Report XV. MSS. at Montague House, Vol. I., 1899. Vol. II., Pt. 1 (1903). Vol. II., Pt. 2 (1903). At Drumlanrig House, Vol. II. (1903).

Bull, George, Bishop of St. David's, Works, collected and revised by Rev. Ed. Burton, 7 vols. in 8. Oxford, 1827.

Burnet, Gilbert, Bishop of Salisbury, History of His Own Time, 6 vols. Oxford, 1833.

[For Bibliography of Burnet's Works see Life, by Clarke and Foxcroft, pp. 522-560].

Calamy, Edmund, Thirteen Sermons. London, 1722.

——— A Defence of Moderate Nonconformity, 3 vols. London, 1703-5.

——— An Abridgement of Mr. Baxter's History, 2 vols. London, 1713.

——— Account of My Own Life, 2 vols. London, 1829.

Chamberlayne, E. and J. C., Anglia Notitia. The 21st edition in 1704 is continued by J. C. Subsequent editions, 1707, 1708, 1710-1716. London.

Coke Papers. Earl Cowper's MSS., Vol. III. Hist. MSS. Commission Report XII. App. Pt. 3. London, 1889.

Collier, Jeremy, Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, new ed. by F. Burham. 8vo. London, 1840-1.

——— Essays (three parts, 1698-1705). London.

——— Short View of the Profaneness and Immorality of the English Stage. London, 1698.

Compton, Henry, Bishop of London, The Life of [? by N. Salmon]. London, undated.

Dartmouth, Earl of, Hist. MSS. Commission Report XI. App. Pt. 5. London, 1887.

Dawes, Sir William, Archbishop of York, Works, with a Preface and a Life of the Author, 3 vols. London, 1733.

Defoe, Daniel, Miscellaneous Works, ed. J. S. Kelie. Edinburgh, 1869.

Dodwell, Henry, Works, abridged, with an Account of his Life, by Francis Brokesby, 2 vols. London, 1723.

Dunton, John, Life and Errors of John Dunton, Citizen of London, ed. by John Nichols, 2 vols. London, 1818.

Eachard, John, Works, 3 vols. London, 1773-4.

Ellis, Sir Henry, Original Letters, with notes and illustrations by H. E. First, second and third series, 11 vols. London, 1824-46.

Evelyn, John, Memoirs, comprising his diary from the year 1641-1705-6, and a selection of his familiar letters, ed. by W. Bray, 2 vols. London, 1818.

——— History of Religion, with Notes by R. M. Evanson, 2 vols. London, 1850.

Fortescue, J. B. Hist. MSS. Commission Report XIII, Pt. 3, Vol. 1. London, 1892.

Frampton, Robert, Bishop of Gloucester, The Life of, deprived as a Non Juror, 1689, ed. by T. S. Evans. London, 1876.

Gibson, Edmund, Bishop of London, Codex juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani, 2 vols. Oxford, 1761.

Grenvelle, Denis, Dean of Durham, Remains of, Surtees Society, 37 and 47. Durham, 1865.
Halifax, Marquis of [Sir George Savile, Bart.], The Life and Letters of, with a new edition of his works, collected and revised by H. C. Foxcroft, 2 vols. London, 1898.
Hearne, Thomas, Life of, in Lives of Leland, Hearne and Wood, ed. by Warton and Huddesford. Oxford, 1772.
Henry, Matthew, Rev., Miscellaneous Works. London, 1830.
Heywood, Oliver, Life, by J. Fawcett, 1796?, Ewood Hall, near Halifax.
——— Life, by Richard Slate, in Works, 1825-7. London.
Hickes, George, titular Bishop of Thetford, unfinished Life to 1689, followed by a complete list of works in Bodleian MS. Engl. Misc. e. 4.
Higgons, Bevill, Historical Works, 2 vols, 1736.
Hodgkin, J. E., Hist. MSS. Commission Report XV. App. Pt. 2. London, 1897.
Hooper, George, Bishop of Bath and Wells, Works, 2 vols. Oxford, 1858.
——— A short Character of, from Hist's Journal. London, 1730.
Howe, John, Whole Works, with a Memoir of the Author, 8 vols. London, 1822.
Johnson, John, of Cranbrook, Life, by T. Brett. London, 1748.
——— Theological Works, 2 vols. Oxford, 1847.
——— The Clergyman's Vade Mecum, 2 vols. London, 1731.
Ken, Thomas, Bishop of Bath and Wells, Works. London, 1721.
——— Prose Works, collected by J. H. Round. London, 1838.
Kennet, White, Bishop of Peterborough, Complete History of England (Vol. III.), 3 vols. London, 1719.
——— Ecclesiastical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations. London, 1701.
——— Life of the Right Rev. Dr. White-Kennett. London, 1730.
Kettlewell, John, B.D., Works, 2 vols. London, 1719.
[Vol. I. includes Life by Dr. Francis Lee].
Lake, Edward, D.D., Sixteen Sermons Preached upon Several Occasions. London, 1705.
Leland, John, D.D., A Defence of Christianity, 2 vols, London, 1753.
——— A View of the Principal Deistical Writers, and an Introduction, London, 1837.
——— Discourses, with Life, 4 vols. London, 1768-9.
Le Neve, John, The Lives and Characters of all the Protestant Bishops since the Reformation. London, 1720.
——— Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae. London, 1716.
——— Monumenta Anglicana, 8 vols. London, 1717-19.
Leslie, Charles, Theological Works, 7 vols. Oxford, 1832.
[Vol. I. includes his Life].
Locke, John, Works, tenth edition, 10 vols. London, 1801.
Lucas, Edmund, Practical Christianity. London, 1700.
——— An Enquiry after Happiness, in three parts, 2 vols. London, 1764.

Macaulay.

Lucas, Edward, Sermons Preached on Several Occasions, 2 vols London, 1702-9.
——— Sermons on Several Occasions and Subjects, 2 vols. London, 1722.
Luttrell, Narcissus, Brief Relation of State Affairs, 6 vols. Oxford, 1857.
Macpherson, James, Original Papers, 2 vols. London, 1775. [And see English Historical Review, xiii., 534 (1898)].
——— History of Great Britain (1660-1714). London, 1775.
Marlborough, Duke of, Memoirs and Correspondence, 3 vols., ed. W. Coxe. London, 1818-9. New edition by J. Wade. London, 1847-8.
——— Conduct of Duke of Malborough during the Present War, by Francis Hall, Bishop of Chichester. London, 1712.
Marlborough, Sarah, Duchess of, Private Correspondence, 2 vols. London, 1838.
——— Letters of. London, 1875.
——— Account of her Conduct, ed. Nath. Hook. London, 1742.
Mar and Kellie, Earl of, Hist. MSS. Commission Report, XVI. London, 1904.
Melmoth, William, The Great Importance of a Religious Life considered. London, 1849.
Miseries and Great Hardships of the Inferior Clergy, published anonymously [by Thomas Stackhouse, A.M.]. London, 1722.
Moray, C. S. H. Drummond, Hist. MSS. Commission, Report X. App. Pt. 1, pp. 137-50. London, 1895.
Mosheim, J. L., Ecclesiastical History, Translated by Archibald Maclaine, D.D., 6 vols. London, 1811.
More, Dr. Henry, Life of, by Richard Ward. London, 1710.
Nelson, Robert, Companion for the Festivals and Fasts. London, 1736.
——— Practice of True Devotion. London, 1726.
——— Great Duty of Frequenting the Christian Sacrifice. London, 1714.
——— An Address to Persons of Quality and Estate. London, 1715.
——— The Whole Duty of a Christian. London, 1727.
——— Life of Bishop Bull, Oxford edition, 1845 for whose works see above.
Nicolson, William, Archbishop of Cashel, Letters on Various Subjects, ed. by John Nichols, 2 vols. London, 1809.
Noble, Rev. Mark, A Biographical History of England from the Revolution . . . in continuation of Granger, 3 vols. London, 1806.
Norris, John, M A., A Collection of Miscellanies, London, 1692.
——— The Theory and Regulation of Love. London, 1688.
——— Practical Discourses upon the Beatitudes, 4 vols. London, 1699, etc.
——— An Account of Reason and Faith in Relation to the Mysteries of Christianity. London, 1697.

North, Roger, Examen, or, an Enquiry into the Credit and Veracity of a Pretended Compleat History of England [Bishop White-Kennet]. London, 1740.
Oldmixon, John, History of the Reign of Queen Anne. London, 1739.
Parkhurst, Nath., The Life of the Rev. William Burkitt. London, 1704.
Parliamentary History, Vol. VI (1702-14). London, 1809.
Paterson, James, Pietas Londinensis. London, 1714.
Patrick, Simon, Bishop of Ely, Mensa mystica, etc. London, 1702.
——— Consolatory Discourses, edit. 1783.
——— On the Work of the Ministry. London, 1698.
——— A Book for Beginners. London, 1705.
——— Autobiography, now first published. Oxford, 1839.
Pepys, Samuel, Diary and Correspondence, ed. Lord Braybrook, 3rd ed. 1848.
Portland, Duke of. Hist. MSS. Commission Report XIII,, Vol. II., App. 2. London, 1891. Report XV., Vol. IV., App. 4. London, 1897. Vol. V.. London, 1899. Vol. VII., 1901.
Preservative against Popery, ed. by John Canning, 18 vols. London, 1848-9.
Prideaux, Humphrey, Dean of Norwich, Directions to Churchwardens. London, 1713.
——— Life of. London, 1748.
Prior, Matthew, Poems, ed. H. R. Waller, 2 vols. Cambridge, 1905-7.
——— Miscellaneous Works, ed. Adrian Drift. London, 1740.
——— Attributed to, History of His Own Times, ed. A. Drift. London, 1740.
Protests of the Lords, ed. by J. E. T. Rogers, Vol. II. Oxford, 1875.
Rapin de Thoyras, Paul, History of England from the Revolution to the Accession of George II. Translated with Continuation by N. Tindal. London, 1747.
Russell, Lady Rachael, Letters of, 2 vols. London, 1773.
Sacheverell, Henry, D.D., The Perils of False Brethren. London, 1709.
[A Bibliography on the Sacheverell Case has been published by F. Madan, reprinted 1884 from the Bibliographer (1883-4) with Additions.]
Salmon Thomas, Impartial Examination of Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Times, 2 vols. London, 1724.
Shaftesbury, Antony Ashley Cooper, Third Earl of, Characteristics, ed. S. M. Robertson, 2 vols. London, 1910.
Sharp, John, Archbishop of York, Works, 7 vols. London, 1754.
——— Life of, by his son, Thomas Sharpe, ed. by Thomas Newcome, 2 vols. London, 1825.
Sherlock, William, Dean of St. Paul's, Sermons, 2 vols. London, 1719.

Sherlock, Thomas, Bishop of London, Works, with some Account of his Life, by the Rev. T. S. Hughes, 5 vols. London, 1830.
Shrewsbury, Duke of, Correspondence of, to 1707, ed. Archdeacon Coxe. London, 1821.
Shrewsbury Papers. In MSS. of the Duke of Buccleugh. Hist. MSS. Commission Report XV., Vol. II., Parts 1, 2. London, 1903.
Smalridge, George, Bishop of Bristol, Miscellanies. London, 1715.
——— Twelve Sermons. Oxford, 1717.
——— Sixty Sermons. London, 1727.
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The Minutes for 1698-1704, ed. by E. McClure. London, 1888.
Somers, Tracts, ed. Sir Walter Scott, XI.—XIII. London, 1823.
Somerset, Duke of, MSS., with those of the Marquis of Ailesbury, Hist. MSS. Commission Report XV., App. Part 7. London, 1898.
South, Robert, Sermons, 12 vols. London, 1704-37.
——— The Character of the Reverend and Learned Dr. Robert South. London, 1716.
Spectator, The, ed. C. G. Smith. London, 1897. Digest Index of. London, 1892.
Spinckes, N., The Sick Man Visited, with a Short Account of the Author. London, 1744.
——— A Collection of Meditations and Devotions. London, 1717.
State Papers, ed. Earl of Hardwicke, Vol. II., pp. 457 et seq. London, 1758.
State Papers for America and the West Indies, 1699-1701, ed. by C. Headlam, 3 vols. London, 1908.
State Trials, Complete Collection, ed. by T. B. Howell and T. J. Howell, 33 vols. London, 1809-26.
Statutes of the Realm, Vols. VIII. and IX. London, 1822.
Steele, Sir R., Correspondence. London, 1787.
——— The Crisis and Apology. London, 1714.
——— The Tatler, ed. G. A. Aitken, 4 vols. London, 1898.
——— The Christian Hero. London, 1727.
——— The Ladies' Library, Vol. III. London, 1751.
Stuart Correspondence, Bishop Atterbury, 2 vols. London, 1847.
Stuart Papers, Calendar of Stuart MSS. belonging to the King, Vols. I.—IV. Hist. MSS. Commission Report XV. London, 1902-10.
Survey of Cities of London and Westminster, Borough of Southwark and Parts Adjacent, by Robert Seymour (?) London, 1734-5.
Swift, Works of, ed. Sheridan and Nichols, 19 vols. London, 1808.
——— Letters, Unpublished, ed. by B. Mell. London, 1899.
Tenison, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, Memoirs of Life, Anon. London, 1716.
Thoresby, Ralph, Diary, 1677—1724, ed. Rev. Joseph Hunter, 2 vols. London, 1830.

Tillotson, John, Archbishop of Canterbury, Works, etc., 12 vols. London, 1757.
——— Life of, by Dr. T. Birch, 2nd edition. London, 1753,
Toland, John, Collection of Several Pieces, with Memoirs, 2 vols. London, 1726.
Trelawny MSS. in Hist. MSS. Commission Report I., pp. 50-2. London, 1870.
Trelawny Papers, Camden Miscellany, Vol. II. London, 1853.
Townsend, Marquis of, Hist. MSS. Commission Report XI., App. Part 4, pp. 48-98. London, 1897.
Wake, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, The Authority of Christian Princes. London, 1697.
——— The State of the Church and Clergy of England in the Convocation. London, 1703.
——— Sermons and Discourses on Several Occasions, 3 vols. London, 1717-22.
Walpole, Robert, Earl of Orford, Memoirs, with Correspondence, ed. by the same, Vol. I. London, 1798.
——— A Short History of the Parliament. London, 1713. [A pamphlet attributed to Walpole].
Ward, John, Vicar of Stratford-on-Avon, Diary. arranged by C. Severn. London, 1839.
Watts, Isaac, Works, 9 vols. London, 1812.
——— Nine Sermons. Oxford, 1812.
Wells, Edward, Treatises, etc. Oxford, 1707.
——— The Rich Man's Duty. London, 1715.
Wentworth Papers, The, Correspondence of Thomas Wentworth, Lord Raby, created Earl of Stafford, ed. J. J. Cartwright. London, 1883.
Wharton, Thomas, First Marquis of, Memoirs of Life, with Speeches, ed. by Sir R. Steele. London, 1745.
Wilkins, David, Concilia Magna Britanniae, 4 vols. London, 1737.
Williams, John, Bishop of Chichester, Twelve Sermons. London, 1708.
Wilson, Thomas, Bishop of Sodor and Man, Works (with Life by Rev. C. Crutwell), 4 vols. Bath, 1796-97.
——— The Principles and Duties of Christianity. London, 1738.
Woodward, Josiah, D.D. The Young Man's Monitor, 13th ed. London, 1802.
——— Fair Warning to a Careless World. London, 1707.
——— The Boyle Lectures of 1710. London, 1712.

Section "B" contains a list of secondary authorities for the period.

Abbey, C. J., and J. H. Overton, The English Church in the 17th Century. London, 1904.
——— ——— The English Church and its Bishops, 1700-1800. London, 1887.

Addison, Joseph, Life of, by Lucy Aikin, 2 vols. London, 1843.
Anderson, J. S. M., History of the Colonial Church, 3 vols. London, 1856.
Anne, Queen, Life of, by Herbert Paul. London, 1906.
Arbuthnot, John, Life of, by G. A. Aitken. London, 1892.
Atterbury, Francis, Life of, by Dean Beeching. London, 1909.
Babington, C., Criticism of Macaulay's Character of the Clergy. London, 1849.
Bolingbroke, Viscount, Life of, by Oliver Goldsmith, new edition. London, 1809.
——— and his Times, by W. Sichel. London, 1901.
——— by R. Harrop. London, 1884.
Brosch, Moritz, Bolingbroke und die Whigs und Tories seiner Zeit. Frankfort, 1883.
Buckle, H. T., History of Civilisation in England, new ed., 3 vols. London, 1872.
Burnet, Bishop, Life of, by Clarke and Foxcroft. Cambridge, 1907.
Burton, J. H., History of the Reign of Queen Anne, 3 vols. London, 1880.
Campagnac, E. T., The Cambridge Platonists. Oxford, 1901.
Coleridge, S. T., Notes on English Divines, ed. D. Coleridge, 2 vols. London, 1853.
Conway, B. K., History of English Philanthropy. London, 1905.
Debary, T., History of the Church of England from 1685 to 1717. London, 1860.
Godolphin, Sidney, Earl of, Life, by H. Elliott. London, 1888.
Hallam, Henry, Constitutional History of England. London, 1827.
Harley, Robert, Earl of Oxford, Life, by E. S. Roscoe. London, 1902.
Hawkins, Ernest, Historical Notices of Missions. London, 1845.
Head, F. W., The Fallen Stuarts. Cambridge, 1901.
Hook, W. F., Dean of Chichester, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, 12 vols. London, 1860-84.
Howe, John, Life and Character of, by H. Rogers, new ed. London, 1863.
Hunt, John, Religious Thought in England from the Reformation to the End of the Last Century, 2 vols. London, 1870-1.
Hunter, J., Rise of the Old Dissent, Exemplified in the Life of O. H. London, 1842.
Hutton, W. H., The English Church, 1625-1714. London, 1903.
Ken, Thomas, Bishop of Bath and Wells, Life of, by the Rev. W. L. Bowles, 2 vols. London, 1830-31.
——— Life of, by a Layman. London, 1851.
Klopp, Onno, Der Fall des Hauses Stuart, 14 vols. Vienna, 1875-88.
Lathbury, Thomas, History of the Convocation of the Church of England. London, 1842.
——— History of the Non-Jurors. London, 1845.
Leadam, I. S. Political History of England, 1702-1760. London, 1909.

Lecky, W. E. H. History of England in the 18th Century (Vol. I.). London, 1897.
——— History of Rationalism, cheap edition. London, 1910.
Mc'Arthy, Justin, History of the Reign of Queen Anne. London, 1905.
Macaulay, Lord, Essays, Vol. V-VIII. of Works, 1866 edition. London, 1866.
——— History of England, 5 vols. London, 1850.
Marlborough, Sarah, Duchess of, Life, by Mrs. Arthur Colville. London, 1904.
Miall, J. G. Congregationalism in Yorkshire. London, 1868.
Overton, J. H., William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic, his Life. London, 1881.
——— Life in the English Church, 1660-1714. London, 1885.
——— The Nonjurors. London, 1902.
Overton, J. H. and F. Relton, The English Church, 1714-1800. London, 1906.
Palin, William, History of the English Church, from the Revolution to the last act of Convocation. London, 1851.
Palmer, Rev. Simon, Nonconformist's Memorial, 2 vols. London, 1775.
Pascoe, C. F., Two Hundred Years of the S. P. G. [1701-1900]. London, 1901.
Pattison, Mark, Essays, 2 vols. Oxford, 1889.
Perry, Canon, History of the Church of England, 3 vols. London, 1861.
Ranke, Leopold Von, History of England, Principally in the Seventeenth Century, 6 vols. Oxford, 1875.
Schlosser, F. C., History of the 18th Century. Translated by D. Davison (Vol. I.). London, 1843.
Secretan, C. F., Life of Robert Nelson. London, 1860.
Sewell, William, History of the Quakers, 2 vols. London, 1795.
Simon, J. S. Revival of Religion in England in the 18th Century. London, 1907.
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, Past and Present (1698-1861). London, 1861.
Somerville, Thomas, History of Great Britain during the Reign of Queen Anne. London, 1798.
Stanhope, Philip Henry, Earl, History of the Reign of Queen Anne. London, 1872.
Steele, Sir Richard, Life of, by G. A. Aitken. London, 1889.
Stoughton, J. Religion in England, 1702-1800, Vol. I. London, 1878.
Strickland, Miss A., Lives of the Queens of England (Vol. 12). London, 1849.
——— Lives of the Seven Bishops. London, 1866.
Swift, Jonathan, Dean of St. Patrick's, Life, by Sir H. Craik, 2 vols. London, 1894.
——— Life of, by Thomas Sheridan. London, 1784.
——— Life of, by Leslie Stephen. London, 1882.

Swift, Lecture on, in English Humourists of the 18th Century, by W. M. Thackeray.
Teal, W. H., Lives of English Laymen. London, 1842.
Tulloch, John, National Theology and Christian Philosophy in the 17th Century, 2 vols. London, 1892.
Waddington, J., Congregational History, 1567-1700. London, 1874.
Ward, A. W., History of Dramatic Literature in the Reign of Queen Anne. 1878.
Warneck, S., History of the Protestant Missions, translated by S. Robson. Edinburgh and London, 1906.
Wren, Sir Christopher, and his times, by J. Elmer. London, 1852.
Wyon, F. W., History of Great Britain under Queen Anne, 2 vols. London, 1876.
[See also for the chief men of the period the Dictionary of National Biography].

Under the next six heads an attempt has been made to classify some of the pamphlet literature bearing on the subject of the Essay. The Collection used is in the main that of the Ryland's Library, Manchester.

SECTION "C" indicates the pamphlets useful for the first portion of the Essay.

The Glorious Memory of a Faithful Prince. J. J. Caesar. London, 1702.
Tom Double returned out of the Country [by Charles Davenant]. London, 1702.
The New Association. Written by Charles Leslie, 3rd ed. London, 1702.
The Old and Modern Whig. London, 1702.
A Debate between Three Ministers of State. London, 1702.
Division our Destruction. [Defoe?]. London, 1702.
Reflections upon a late Paper. London, 1702.
The Quaker, no Occasional Conformist. London, 1703.
Some Remarks on the late Letter. By Rev. John Sage. 1703.
The Exorbitant Grants of William III. 2nd ed. London, 1705.
A Sermon. By Ofspring Blackall. London, 1704.
Helter-Skelter, or The Devil between Two Sticks. London, 1703.
A Hymn to Victory. Defoe. London, 1704.
A Letter from a Member of Parliament. By Sir H. Mackworth. London, 1704.
True State of the Controversy between the Present Bishop and Dean of Carlisle. London, 1704.
——— 2nd edition, to which is added A Letter from the South. London, 1705.
Cassandra [by Charles Leslie]. 2 parts in 1. London, 1704-5.

Mr. Sacheverell's Assize Sermon . . . Examined. London, 1704.
Letter to a Friend concerning the new distinction of High and Low Church. London, 1704.
An Elegy on the Burning of the Church Memorial. 1705.
Daniel the Prophet no Conjuror. London, 1705.
Memorial of the State of England. London, 1705.
Memorial of the Church of England. London, 1705.
Letter to the Author of the Memorial of the State. London, 1705.
The New Association. Part 2, 2nd ed. London, 1705.
The Reduction of Scotland by Arms. London, 1705.
Letter to the Author of the Memorial . . . Answered. London, 1706.
Articles of the Treaty of Union. London, 1706.
A Short Letter to the Glasgow Men. 1706.
The Lord Beilhaven's Speech. 1706.
Journal of the Commissioners in the Treaty of Union. Edinburgh, 1706.
A Warning for the Church of England. London, 1706.
Sermon . . . at the Mercat-Cross. London, 1707.
A Sermon. By the Bishop of Oxford, on May 1st, 1707. London, 1707.
A Thanksgiving Sermon. By Daniel Williams. London, 1707.
Two Great Questions considered. 1707.
A Sermon of Thanksgiving before the Queen. By Burnet. London, 1707.
One Nation, and one King. By John Edwards. London, 1707.
A Sermon. By John Ollyffe. London, 1707.
A Thanksgiving Sermon. By Giles Dent. London, 1707.
A Sermon. By Richard Allen. London, 1707.
A Sermon. By T. Manningham. London, 1707.
A Thanksgiving Sermon. By J. Bates. London, 1707.
A Sermon. By Joseph Stennett. London, 1707.
The Blessings of the Sixth Year. By the Bishop of Carlisle. Edinburgh, 1707.
A Thanksgiving Sermon. By Chr. Taylor. London, 1707.
An Answer to Dr. Sacheverell's Sermon. By White Kennett. London, 1709.
The Peril of being Zealously Afflicted, but not Well. London, 1709.
Blenheim, A Poem. London, 1709.
Remarks on Dr. Sach——'s Sermon. W. Bisset. London, 1709.
The Whigs have lost their Smell. [London, 1710.]
The History of Resistance as practised by the Church of England. John Withers. London, 1710.
True, Genuine, Tory Address [by B. Hoadly]. [London] 1710.
Thoughts of an Honest Tory [by Benj. Hoadly]. London, 1710.
Remarks on . . . the Bishop of Salisbury's Speech. Nottingham, 1710.
Serious Advice to the Good People of England [by B. Hoadly]. [London] 1710.
Reflections on Dr. Sacheverell's Answer. London, 1710.
The Secret History of Arlus. [London] 1710.

Reasons for a Total Change of a Certain M[inistry]. London, [1710].
The Playhouse Scuffle. London, 1710.
Priestcraft in Perfection [by Anthony Collings]. London, 1710.
The Impartial, Secret History of Arlus. 1710.
A Letter concerning Allegiance [by B. Hoadly?]. London, 1710.
A Caveat against the Whigs [by Charles Hornby]. London, 1710.
Diologue betwixt Whig and Tory. London, 1710.
A Seasonable and Modest Apology. London, 1710.
True Passive Obedience Restored. London, 1710.
Refutation of Doctrine of Passive Obedience. London, 1710.
The Mobb's Address to my Lord M—. 1710.
The French King's Thanks to the Tories [by B. Hoadley]. [London] 1710.
The Fears and Sentiments of all True Britains [by B. Hoadly]. London, 1710.
Faults on Both Sides. London, 1710.
Faults on Both Sides [by Richard Harley], by way of Answer to The Thoughts of an Honest Tory. London, 1710.
The Good Old Cause or Lying in Truth. By Misodolus. London, 1710.
Serious Enquiry into the present state of the Church of England [by Benj. Hoadly]. London, 1711.
The Thoughts of a Church of England Divine. London, 1711.
Answer to a Letter to Mr. Hoadly entitled Faith and Obedience. London, 1711.
Eleven Opinions about Mr. Harley. London, 1711.
No Queen, or No General. London, 1712.
Law is a Bottomless Pit. London, 1712.
Complete Key to Law is . . . London, 1712.
Salt for the Leach . . . 2nd ed. London, 1712.
The Life of the Reverend and Learned Mr. John Sage [by John Gillan]. London, 1714.
A Sermon . . . before the House of Commons. T. Sherlock. London, 1714.
The Mourning Prophet. By E[dward] W[ard]. London, 1714.
Vindication of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Norwich [by John Lewis]. London, 1714.
A Vindication of the Earl of Oxford. 1715.
An Account of the Conduct of Robert, Earl of Oxford [by D. Defoe?]. London, 1715.
The Trial of Robert, Earl of Harley. London, 1717.

SECTION "D" indicates the pamphlets useful for the second portion of the Essay.

TOLERATION, ETC.

Enquiry into the Occasional Conformity of Dissenters. By Daniel Defoe. London, 1697.
Letter to a Member of Parliament, shewing that a restraint of the Press . . . 1698.
A Third Narrative. By George Keith. London, 1698.

An Epistle to the People called Quakers. Everard Margaret. London, 1699.
Some Remarks on . . . Mr. Henry Cornish. By White Kennett. London, 1699.
A Profession of Faith. By E. S. London, 1700.
A List of the Monasterys, Nunnerys and Colleges. London, 1700.
Letter to the Reverend Lord Bishops of his Province, concerning the late Act against Popery. London, 1700.
Answer to some Queries [by Henry Gandy]. London, 1700.
Appeal to all Protestant Kings. London, 1700.
A Tract concerning Schism and Schismatics. By J. Hales. London, 1700.
Letter in Vindication of the Answer to the Queries [by Henry Gandy]. London, 1701.
A Bill . . . for Preventing Occasional Conformity. London, 1702.
An Account of the Proceedings of the Lords. London, 1702.
Three Questions. London, 1702.
The Danger of Priestcraft. London, 1702.
The Case fairly stated. London. 1702.
The Case of Toleration recognized. London, 1702.
An Enquiry into Occasional Conformity. London, 1702.
Present Danger of Popery in England. London, 1703.
Reflections upon . . . a . . . Pamphlet entitul'd The Shortest Way with the Dissenters (with the said Pamphlet entire). London, 1703.
Draught of an Act for Toleration. 1703.
Contra Torrentem Brachia. London, 1703.
Meldrum—Sermon preached in Edinburgh. 1703.
The Reduction of Episcopacy. Edinburgh, 1703.
A few Brief and Modest Reflections. 1703.
A Full and Final Answer. Edinburgh, 1703.
A Vindication and Defence. Edinburgh, 1703.
The Fox with his Firebrand Unkennell'd. London, 1703.
A Defence of the Dissenters' Education. By Samuel Palmer. London, 1703.
The Interest of England considered. 2nd ed. London, 1703.
A Defence of the Letter concerning the Education of Dissenters. By Samuel Wesley. London, 1704.
The Orator Displayed. London, 1704.
Expostulatory Letters. London, 1704.
A Letter from a Country Divine . . . concerning the Education of the Dissenters. By S. Wesley. 2nd ed. London, 1704.
The Wolf Stript. 4th ed. London, 1704.
The Bishop of Salisbury's Proper Defence. London, 1704.
A Vindication of the Learning . . . of the Dissenters. By Samuel Palmer. London, 1705.
Review of the Dangers of the Church. [A pamphlet by J. Drake and H. Pooley]. London, 1705.
An Essay towards a Proposal for Catholic Communion . . . Answered. By Nath. Spinckes. London, 1705.

Reasons why several of the Clergy . . . [London? 1705].
Occasional Thoughts upon the Memorial of the Church of England. London, 1705.
Moderation Vindicated. London, 1705.
The Devil upon Dun. [London] 1705.
The Sequel. London, 1705.
The Countryman's Remembrances. London, 1705.
The Experiment. London, 1705.
The Covenant to be the Lord's People. By Joseph Jacobs. London. 1706.
The Danger of the Church of England. London, 1706.
Ecclesiae versae, non eversae. London, 1707.
Answer to a late pamphlet entitled "The Experiment." London, 1707.
An Account of the Government of the Church of Scotland. London, 1708.
Annus Secundus Mirabilis. London, 1708.
Remarks on the Rehearsal. London, 1708.
Danger of Moderation. London, 1708.
The Scot's Narrative Examined. London, 1709.
The Modern Fanatic. By W. Bisset. London, 1710.
Disputes Review'd. By Matthew Henry. London, 1710.
The Counter-Queries, Queried again. 1710.
Enquiry into the Present Duty of a Low Churchman [by James Peirce]. London, 1712.
Sermon to the Societies for Reformation of Manners. London, 1712.
Popery and Spiritual Tyranny [by Matthew Henry]. London, 1712.
A Humble Address to the Princes and States of Europe. W. Whiston. London, 1714.
The Interest of England in Relation to Protestant Dissenters. London, 1714.
Letter from a Layman [by J. S. Barrington, Viscount]. London, 1714.
Dr. Brett's Vindication. London, 1715.

SECTION "E" indicates the pamphlets useful for the third portion of the Essay.

EVANGELICALISM, ETC.

Advice to the Clergy of the Diocese of Lincoln. J. Gardiner, Bishop of Lincoln. London, 1697.
A Plain Man's Essay for England's Prosperity. London, 1698.
A Persuasive to Frequent Communion. By John, late Archbishop of Canterbury. London, 1698.
A Sermon concerning Reformation of Manners. By S. Wesley. London, 1698.
Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishops of his Province. T. Tenison. London, 1699.

Discourse concerning Meekness. By Matthew Henry. London, 1699.
Sermon on Acts xxviii., 22. By Matthew Henry. London, 1699.
The Poor Man's Plea. Defoe. London, 1700.
Essays concerning Excommunication. Ed. Hickeringhall. London [1700?].
An Account of the Societies for Reformation of Manners. London, 1700.
Letter from a Clergyman in the Diocese of Bath and Wells. [London] 1701.
A Sermon preach'd at . . . Sarum. By T. Naish. London, 1701.
Reasonableness of the Augmentation of Poor Vicarages [by Thomas Breck]. Cambridge, 1702.
Some Expedients without which . . . London, 1703.
The Form of Dedication and Consecration of a Church, etc. London, 1703.
Articles concerning Matters Ecclesiastical. J. Gardiner, Bishop of Lincoln. London, 1703.
The Resolution of a Case of Conscience [by Samuel Grascome]. London, 1703.
A Sermon. Auchinleck. Edinburgh, 1704.
Principle of the Protestant Reformation. London, 1704.
A Sermon concerning the right Managements of Friendly Visits. By Matthew Henry. London, 1704.
A Church in the House. By Matthew Henry. London, 1704.
Plain English. 5th ed. London, 1704.
A Disswasive from Gaming. London, 1704.
Eleventh Conference with his Clergy. H. Compton, Bishop of London. London, 1704.
The Case of Impropriations. White Kennett. London, 1704.
An Account of the Methods whereby Charity Schools . . . London, 1705.
A Vindication of the Apostles. London, 1705.
An Earnest Perswasive to the Serious Observance of the Lord's Day. 1705.
A Short Answer to the Objections. 1705.
A Disswasive from the horrid and beastly Sin of Drunkenness. London, 1705.
A Short Disswasive from the Sin of Uncleanness. London, 1705.
A Kind Caution to Prophane Swearers. London, 1705.
Sermon, Judges v., 8 [Soc. Ref. Manners]. By W. Nicolson, Archbishop of Cashel. London, 1706.
M. J., Presbyter of the Church of England: A Humble Proposal. London, 1706.
The Excellency of the Duty of Religious Unity. London, 1706.
A Sermon . . . at the Funeral of the Rev. Mr. James Owen. By Matthew Henry. London, 1706.
The Case of the Curate of Penrith. London, 1707.
An Answer . . . to the Case of the Curate of Penrith. Hugh Todd. London, 1707.

Charge to the Clergy of his Diocese. By W. Wake. London, 1707.
A Sermon preached at the Funeral of William, Duke of Devonshire. White Kennett. London, 1708.
St. James's Park. A Satyr. London, 1709.
The Case of the Indigent Poor considered. John Bellers. [London] 1709.
Articles of Visitation. William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury. [London] 1709.
Letter to the Clergy of his Diocese. William Wake. [London, 1709].
Remarks upon . . . Dr. Edward's Preacher. Robert Lightfoot. London, 1709.
A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Norwich. Charles Trimnell. London, 1710.
A Sermon concerning the Work . . . of the Ministry. By M. Henry. London, 1710.
Dr. Edward's Vindication consider'd. Robert Lightfoot. London, 1710.
A Sermon preach'd before the House of Commons. Andrew Snape. London, 1711.
Her Majesties Most Gracious Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. London [1711].
Charge to the Clergy of his Diocese [by Chas. Trimnell, Bp. of Worcester]. London, 1712.
Ecclesiastical Self-Seeking: A Visitation Sermon. Edward Symmons. London, 1712.
The Poor Vicar's Plea against his Glebes. London, 1712.
Articles of Visitation and Enquiry exhibited to Ministers, etc. T. Tenison. [London] 1713.
A Funeral Sermon upon Mr. Noble. London, 1713.
A Scripture Catechism. By Matthew Henry. London, 1714.
A Church of England Man's Serious Thoughts upon the Bill Against Dissenting Schoolmasters. [Signed H. B.] London, 1714.
A Funeral Sermon . . . on Rev. John Russell. By J. Nesbitt. London, 1714.
Funeral Sermon on Mr. Henry. [By J. Reynolds. London, 1714.
——— By D. Williams. London, 1714.
——— By W. Tong. London, 1714.
——— On Mr. Billio and Mr. Henry. By J. Bates London, 1714.
——— On . . . John Hoskyns. By John Sprint. London, 1714.
Charge, at his Primary Visitation. By George Smalridge. Oxford, 1716.
Of Visitations, Parochial and General. By Ed. Gibson. London, 1717.
The Standing Orders and Resolutions of the S.P.C.K. London, 1717.

See the Brltish Museum Catalogue under London, p. 286—293, for publications relating to the Religious Societies.

For Dr. T. Bray see British Museum Catalogue, "Brav—Bretz, p. 11—13.

SECTION "F" indicates the pamphlets useful for the fourth portion of the Essay.

CONVOCATION.

Reflections on a Book entitled, "The Rights . . ." By Gilbert, Bishop of Sarum. London, 1700.
The Power of the Lower House of Convocation to adjourn itself [by Francis Atterbury]. London, 1701.
Narrative of the Proceedings of the Lower House [by Henry Aldrich]. London, 1701.
Principles of Mr. Atterbury's Book [by Richard West], London, 1701.
The Right of the Archbishop . . . Asserted in a Second Letter. London, 1701.
The Schedule Review'd [by Ed. Gibson]. London, 1702.
Vindicius Liberius, or Mr. Toland's Defence. London, 1702.
Present State of Convocation London, 1702.
The Marks of a Defenceless Cause [by Ed. Gibson]. London, 1703.
The Pretended Independence of the Lower House [by Ed. Gibson]. London, 1703.
Short State of some Present Questions in Convocation [by Ed. Gibson]. London, 1703.
A New Danger of Presbytery. London, 1703.
An Account of the Proceedings between the Two Houses [by Charles Trimnell]. London, 1704.
A Representation made by the Lower House of Convocation. London, 1705.
The Complainer Reproved [by Ed. Gibson]. London, 1705.
The Complainer Further Reproved [by Ed. Gibson]. London, 1705.
Collection of Papers concerning . . . Convocation. London, 1705.
Proceedings in the Present Convocation. London, 1706.
An Account of the Proceedings in the Convocation which began Oct. 25, 1705. London, 1706.
An Account and Defence of the Protestation made by the Lower House. London, 1707.
Circular Letter to the . . . Bishops of his Province. T. Tenison. London, 1707.
An Account of the Convocation's Proceedings with relation to Mr. Whiston. London, 1711.
Case of the Present Convocation Consider'd [by W. Wotton]. London, 1711.
Representation of the Present State of Religion. London, 1711.
The Nation Vindicated [by Matthew Tindal]. London, 1711—12
The Doctrine of Remission of Sins . . . Vindicated. By Thomas Brett. London, 1712.
An Account of the Two Motions made in . . . Convocation Concerning the Power of Remitting Sins. London, 1712.
A Speech to the Upper House of Convocation. George Smalridge. London, 1714.

SECTION "G" indicates the pamphlets useful for the fifth portion of the Essay.

JACOBITISM.

The Present State of Jacobitism Considered. By D. F. [*i.e.* D. Defoe]. London, 1701.
An Argument showing that the Prince of Wales . . . , London, 1701
A Letter to a Minister of State. London, 1701.
Animadversions on the Two Last 30th of January Sermons. 1702.
England's Black Tribunal. 4th ed. London, 1703.
An Impartial Enquiry into the Causes of Rebellion . . . in this Kingdom. London, 1704.
A Discourse of a Cavalier Gentleman. By Don A. B. London, 1706.
A Sermon. By William, Bishop of Lincoln. London, 1708.
The Reasons of the Absenting Clergy. London, 1710.
The Jacobitism, Perjury and Popery of High Church Priests [J. Toland]. London, 1710.
Reasons Against Receiving the Pretender [by B. Hoadly]. London, 1710.
The Jacobite's Hopes Reviv'd [by B. Hoadly]. London, 1710.
The Several Declarations made in Council . . . concerning the Birth of the Prince of Wales. London [1711].
Observations on the Depositions concerning the Birth of the Prince of Wales. London, 1911.
Old Stories which were the Forerunners of the Revolution in '88 Reviv'd. London, 1711.
The Scotch Medal Decipher'd. London, 1711.
Scotch Loyalty Exemplify'd. London, 1711.
The Pretender, an Imposter. London, 1711.
Full Answer to the Depositions concerning the Birth. [London] 1711.
Some Queries Proposed. London, 1712.
Character of a Popish Successour [by Elkanah Settle]. London, 1712.
The French King's Promise to the Pretender. London, 1712.
The Pretender's Declaration Abstracted from Two Anonymous Pamphlets. [John Asgill]. London, 1713.
A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Carlisle. By W. K. [*i.e.*, White Kennet. London, 1713.
Some New Proofs. London, 1713.
The Pretender's Declaration. By Mr. Asgill. London, 1713.
More Memoirs on The Pretender. London, 1713.
The Reason and Necessity of the Duke of Cambridge's coming to . . . Great Britain. London, 1714.
Detection of the Sophistry . . . of . . . the Secret History. London, 1714.
Memoirs of John, Duke of Melfort. 1714.
The Revolution and Anti-Revolution Principles. London, 1714.

Remarks on Mr. Steele's Crisis. London, 1714.
Britain's Alarm to all True Protestants. London, 1714.
Considerations upon the Secret History of the White Staff. London [1714].
Seasonable Queries relating to the Birth . . . of a certain Person [The Pretender]. London, 1714.
Hannibal not at our Gates. London, 1714.
A Letter from the Earl of Mar to the King. By Sir Richard Steele. London, 1715.
The Case of the Lord Bolingbroke. 1715.
A Declaration of the Archbishop of Canterbury. London, 1715.
A Defence of the Church of England and the Clergy. London, 1715.
Remarks on The Pretender's Declaration. London, 1715.
A Full and Authentic Narrative of the . . . Conspiracy and Invasion. London, 1715.
A View of the Scot's Rebellion. London, 1715.

SECTION "H" indicates the pamphlets useful for the sixth portion of the Essay.

RATIONALISM, ETC.

Christianity not Mysterious. J. Toland. London, 1695.
Animadversions on a late book entituled "The Reasonableness of Christianity as Delivered in the Scriptures." Oxford, 1697.
Defence of Mr. Toland, in a Letter to Himself. London, 1697.
Remarks upon an Essay concerning Human Understanding. By W. Hayley. London, 1697.
A Sermon Preached at Cambridge. By Francis Hutchinson. Cambridge, 1698.
An Argument proving that . . . Man may be Translated from hence into that Eternal Life without passing through Death. [London?] 1700.
Morosophomisos. London, 1701.
Reflections upon Mr. Toland's book. 2nd ed. London, 1701.
Letter to Mr. Fleetwood [by Benj. Hoadley]. London, 1702.
Defence of The Right Reverend Lord Bishop of Sarum [by Benj. Hoadley]. London, 1703.
My Lord of Sarum's Exposition. London, 1703.
A Philosophical Discourse of the Nature of Rational and Irrational Souls. London, 1704.
Sermon by Henry Walker. Edinburgh, 1706.
An Essay concerning the Use of Reason in Propositions. London, 1707.
A Sermon. By Tho. Knaggs. London, 1708.
A Short View of the Pretended Spirit of Prophecy. London, 1708.
A Philosophical Discourse concerning the Natural Immortality of the Soul. London, 1708.

A Reply to Mr. Clark's Defence of his Letter to Mr. Dodwell. By Anthony Collins. London, 1709.
A Letter to the learned Dodwell By Anthony Collins. London, 1709.
Essay concerning the Use of Reason in Propositions, the Evidence whereof Depends upon Human Testimony [by Anthony Collins]. London, 1709.
Reply to Mr. Clark's Defence [by Anthony Collins]. London, 1709.
Letter to the learned Mr. Dodwell [by Anthony Collins]. London, 1909.
Misodolos. The Good Old Cause. 2 parts in 1 vol. London, 1710.
New Pretenders to Prophecy examined [by Nath. Spruckes]. London, 1710.
Reflections on Mr. Clark's Second Defence [by Anthony Collins]. London, 1711.
Answer to Mr. Clark's Third Defence [by Anthony Collins]. London, 1711.
A Defence of the Proceedings against Jane Wenham. Francis Bragge. London, 1712.
A Discourse for the Vindication of Christianity. By Dean Prideaux. London, 1712.
Witchcraft further Displayed. By F. B. London, 1712.
Answer to that Part of Dr. Brett's Sermon which relates to the Incapacity of Persons not Episcopally Ordain'd to Administer Christian Baptism [by Arthur Ashley Sykes]. London, 1712.
The Impossibility of Witchcraft. London, 1712.
Case of the Hertfordshire Witchcraft Considered. London, 1712.
Divine Origin and Incomparable Excellence [Boyle Lectures]. By J. Woodward. London, 1712.
Full Confutation of Witchcraft. London, 1712.
A Full and Impartial Account of the Discovery of Sorcery and Witchcraft [by Francis Bragge]. London, 1712.
The Clergyman's Thanks to Phileleutherus. London, 1713.
Discourse of Freethinking [by Anthony Collins]. London, 1713.
Directions . . . for the Preserving of Unity in the Church , . . concerning the Holy Trinity. London, 1714.
Difficulties . . . which Attend the Study of the Scriptures [by Francis Hare]. London, 1714.

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED
LOAN DEPT.
This book is due on the last date stamped below, or on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

RECEIVED
DEC 21 '66 -3 PM
LOAN DEPT.

MAY 18 1976

REC. CIR. MAY 18 '76

LD 21A-60m-7,'66
(G4427s10)476B

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

LD 21-100m-7,'33

YB 30722

327066

BX5[illegible]
W5

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY